CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.532
6 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 6 February 1990 at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

GE.90-60110/1543B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 532nd plenary meeting and the first part of the 1990 session of the Conference on Disarmament. It is a privilege and an honour for me to take up the presidency of the Conference, on behalf of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, for the month of February. At the outset, I should like to pledge to all of you my unreserved co-operation and that of my delegation in discharging my responsibilities. I shall always be available to any member wishing to approach the Chair and, of course, I will rely on your valuable assistance in dealing with the questions that are before us.

As President of the Conference, I am very pleased to extend a warm welcome in our midst to two distinguished personalities attending this opening plenary meeting. I should like to note that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, His Excellency Hans van den Broek, has decided to address the Conference at this opening plenary meeting to emphasize once more, at the beginning of the Netherlands presidency of the Conference, his personal interest and support, as well as that of his Government, in the work of this multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. Minister van den Broek has addressed the Conference on two previous occasions, and is therefore well known to it.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, His Excellency Alois Mock, has expressed the wish to address the Conference today. The Minister has visited the Conference before and has shared with us his thoughtful views on subjects under consideration. As you know, his country has for several years now been participating actively in our work as a non-member. I would point out that during my consultations, members expressed to me their desire that the Minister be invited, as a matter of courtesy, to deliver his statement today before we deal with all the requests from non-members for participation in the work of the Conference. Accordingly, I shall be very happy to give him the floor. I am sure that all members will listen with particular interest to the statements that the Ministers will make today, and I should like to thank them for having taken time from their busy schedules to share with us their thoughts on vital questions of disarmament.

Allow me also, on behalf of the Conference, to thank my predecessor, Ambassador El Ghali Benhima of Morocco, for the outstanding manner in which he conducted our work during the month of August. His diplomatic skills, experience and knowledge of multilateral diplomacy were valuable assets for the Conference, in particular during the difficult task of preparing our annual report.

Since the last annual session of the Conference, several friends and colleagues have left us. I refer to the representatives of Canada, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Romania, the United States of America and Venezuela. We wish all of them every success in their future activities and all personal happiness. While I am sure that we shall miss all of them, I wish to refer in particular to the departure of a distinguished personality who has successfully devoted much of his brilliant career to disarmament. I refer to Ambassador Alfonso García Robles of Mexico, who has represented his country with distinction in this Conference since 1967, one of the two Nobel Peace Prize laureates who have served in the Conference and the architect of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. He was the dean of the disarmament diplomatic community, and has made an indelible mark on this body's deliberations.

(The President)

At the same time, I am happy to welcome to the Conference the new representatives who have recently been appointed as leaders of their delegations: Ambassadors Roberto García Moritán of Argentina, Gerald Shannon of Canada, Hou Zhitong of China, José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico, Stephen Ledogar of the United States of America and Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela. To all of them we extend our best wishes in the performance of their important duties.

I should also like to welcome the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Yasushi Akashi, who is following our proceedings today. Under the direction of Ambassador Akashi the Department provides substantive support for the Conference. I wish to thank him for his continued interest in our work and for the very efficient manner in which he responds to the requirements of this multilateral disarmament negotiating forum.

I wish also, as President of this Conference, to refer to the untimely death of a member of the secretariat, Mademoiselle Annie Rebuzzi, who had been with us for the last two years. During that period, Mademoiselle Rebuzzi was highly regarded by the Conference for her professional and personal qualities. She will be missed by us and by her friends and colleagues in the secretariat, and I should like to ask the Secretary-General of the Conference, Ambassador Komatina, to transmit to her parents, on behalf of the Conference, our deeply felt condolences on their irreparable loss.

We shall now proceed to the order of business for today. There are a number of urgent organizational matters which need to be settled to permit the Conference to start its consideration of matters of substance. I refer to the adoption of the agenda and programme of work, as well as the re-establishment of subsidiary bodies on various items on the agenda. I hope, in particular, that we can soon resume our work on a convention banning chemical weapons, in the spirit of the agreement achieved in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. I am encouraged by the progress noted in my consultations on the mandate to be adopted for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Early agreement on that text will make it possible to intensify our negotiations under the dynamic chairmanship of Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden. I am expecting that we shall re-establish today the Ad hoc Committees on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Radiological Weapons, with their present mandates, and appoint their Chairmen. As the agenda item entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space" is one of the major issues before the international community, I also hope that the Ad hoc Committee dealing with that question will begin its work without delay. I believe that, if we succeed in taking the relevant decisions quickly, the Conference will have made a good start.

We shall also consider other proposals dealing with the manner in which the Conference should consider other agenda items. In that connection, I should like to recall that we still need to find appropriate organizational frameworks for the nuclear issues on the agenda. In particular, I wish to stress the importance of the informal individual consultations held last year by the repesentative of Japan, with the encouragement of successive Presidents of the Conference, on an adequate mandate for an Ad hoc Committee under agenda

(The President)

item 1, entitled "Nuclear test ban". I understand that those consultations will continue. I welcome the initiative taken by the representative of Japan, and I wish him success in his efforts. Of course, I remain available to assist him and other members in their efforts.

Last but not least, we shall deal with requests for participation from non-member States. I believe that the Conference should respond swiftly to the promising fact that no less than 30 States not members have signified their interest in being involved in our work during the 1990 session. Multilateral disarmament negotiations can only benefit from such wide participation, as this will ensure that one of the functions of this body - achieving agreements of universal acceptance - is properly fulfilled.

As you know, the question of the expansion of the membership of the Conference is still pending, in spite of the fact that its consideration started eight years ago. I hope that a solution can be found which will allow us to discharge this responsibility towards the international community. Another subject requiring review is the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. My own delegation has contributed actively to our work in this field by submitting various proposals, including some dealing with our annual programme of work. I intend to conduct consultations to determine how best we can continue our consideration of this matter.

I should now like to give the floor to the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who will read out a message addressed to the Conference by Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): The following is the message of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Conference on Disarmament.

"After a long period of conflicts, tensions and mistrust we are witnessing growing signs of progress in the search for a stable and permanent peace. The past year has proved to be a year of consolidation of trends in that direction.

"Although global stability and peace have yet to be attained, positive developments in international relations continue to gain impetus. The growing rapprochement between East and West, movement towards settlement of various regional conflicts, important political changes in Europe and other regions of the world and the growing involvement of the United Nations in major issues facing the international community create a favourable atmosphere. New opportunities are now offered for the pursuit of more meaningful measures in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. I note the successful implementation of the INF Treaty and an encouraging momentum in the START negotiations. These are significant signs of progress in addressing the challenges in the world today.

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

"The wide spectrum of bilateral and multilateral negotiations and the subjects with which they deal generate hope that the current trend will become irreversible, allowing the process of disarmament to proceed at a faster pace. Tangible contributions to this process came from the meeting of heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries held in Belgrade in September 1989, and from the meeting of the leaders of the two major Powers in Malta held in December 1989. We welcome their declarations that it is time to leave the epoch of the cold war to move to a more secure world. All these efforts to turn 1990 into a year of concrete arms limitation and disarmament agreements must be welcomed.

"I have often stressed the overriding importance of the early conclusion of a multilateral agreement on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, transfer and use of chemical weapons, and on their destruction. In 1989 political consensus was advanced in the international community on the urgent need to agree on such a convention. There now exist ever-growing resolve and an explicit pledge to deal with pending problems at the earliest possible date. The Final Declaration of 149 States at the Paris Conference testified to the truly universal awareness of the need to eradicate chemical weapons for ever. In that connection, I also commend the initiative of the Government of Australia to strengthen and expand co-operation between the chemical industry and Governments by convening a Government-Industry Conference in Canberra.

"Once again I appeal to the members of the Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to use the political momentum generated by all those events and intensify during this current session the negotiations for the final elaboration of the convention. There is no justification for unnecessary delay. I am confident that all States will abide by their commitments to achieve that objective.

"The Conference on Disarmament remains entrusted with the consideration of other important subjects of a global nature which continue to require urgent multilateral action. The United Nations has repeatedly assigned the highest priority to the issue of cessation of all nuclear test explosions. The encouraging signs witnessed in the bilateral negotiations should be further advanced. However, I remain convinced that a complete ban on such tests can pave the way to nuclear disarmament and rid the world of the nuclear menace. The Conference on Disarmament has an irreplaceable role to play in that respect. Efforts to amend the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 and turn it into a comprehensive test ban reflect widespread concern over the present situation.

"Nor can the Conference on Disarmament renounce its responsibility for the consideration of issues of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. I hope that the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons will provide impetus to that process.

"There is a convergence of views that outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. As emphasized on many occasions, the

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

Conference on Disarmament has the primary role in the prevention of an arms race in outer space. This is a global issue, since any military activity in outer space is relevant to the whole world.

"I hope that positive changes in international relations will favourably influence the consideration of items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The importance of bilateral and regional agreements for the disarmament process, in both nuclear and conventional issues, cannot be overstated. Equally, this progress must be matched by advances in this multilateral forum. To do so, the Conference on Disarmament - the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum - must be permitted to play its negotiating role to the full.

"I wish you every success in your work."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his statement. I should be grateful if he would transmit to Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar our appreciation for the important message that he has conveyed to us.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has also addressed to me a letter transmitting the resolutions and decisions on disarmament which were adopted at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly. That letter and its attachments have been circulated today as document CD/959.

I have on my list of speakers the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, His Excellency Hans van den Broek, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, His Excellency Alois Mock, and the representatives of Mexico and Sweden. The representative of Mexico will also speak at the end of the list in his capacity as Co-ordinator of the Group of 21.

I take particular pleasure in now giving the floor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, His Excellency Hans van den Broek.

Mr. van den BROEK (Netherlands): Mr. President, it is a very special pleasure for me today to be amongst the first to congratulate you on taking up the presidency for this month, and, if you will allow me to add a few personal words, I think it is most gratifying to see my old friend Ambassador Hendrik Wagenmakers in the Chair. It seems that the month of February usually provides a couple of thorny issues to grapple with, but I can assure you distinguished members of the Conference on Disarmament that the task of solving these problems, or at least helping to solve them, is certainly in good hands.

I also join you, Mr. President, in thanking the outgoing President, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, for the able and balanced way in which he presided over the Conference, and I also extend on my part a warm welcome to the newcomers to the Conference. I note that amongst them there is vast experience in the field of arms control and disarmament, and we hope to benefit greatly from this experience. A reassuring thought is that delegations will continue to profit from the expeditious, professional

(Mr. van den Broek, Netherlands)

assistance of the secretariat, so ably guided by Ambassador Komatina. And in this introduction I also wish to voice a special salute to my colleague and friend, Mr. Alois Mock, Foreign Minister of Austria and, as I know from experience, a staunch supporter of movements towards peace and détente. I have to pity him somewhat because he will speak after me: if we don't say the same thing it will be thought that we disagree, while if we do say the same it will be said to be duplication. I know Alois, that you are very capable and very able in dealing with such dilemmas, and I also wish the Conference a lot of interesting moments when you address this Conference - it's good to see you here.

In a speech to representatives of the international community such as yourselves, I cannot ignore the events which shook the European continent in the revolutionary year of 1989, the year that marked the end of the post-war era as we see it. Pluralist democracy and human freedom are gaining ground, and I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to those who have dedicated themselves to this goal, showing great creativity and political courage, and sometimes even paying with their lives.

The turbulent developments in Europe have not yet come to an end. Free elections, leading to the establishment of legitimate Governments, have still to be held. There is also an urgent need for drastic economic reforms to enable the societies of Central and Eastern Europe to sustain themselves. I believe that Western countries have a duty to lend their moral, financial and political support to this process.

This is not the place for a detailed examination of the ways we can help, or the specific features of the wave of democratization in individual countries. I realize that for some of you this will have a very personal dimension. I would, however, like to say a few words about the debate on what is being called the "new architecture" of Europe.

The removal of the "iron curtain" has eroded traditional political barriers between East and West. The certainties of the cold war have rapidly disappeared, but what is to take their place? What sort of new order should we strive to achieve? I should like to emphasize that it is not a question of devising blueprints or new structures just for the sake of it. We should aim at a gradual process, one which guarantees stability, and one which ensures that the new structures reflect the will of the people. In this respect, I am thinking primarily of efforts to overcome the division of Europe and, more particularly, the division of Germany. It is not for me to provide a formula for solving this question this morning. But I would like to emphasize the following. The inherent right to self-determination of all peoples is paramount. This certainly applies to the German people as well. I can understand the emotions of a divided nation, and I can also understand the misgivings about a renewed Germany that is not embedded in a structure of stability. Such a structure of stability is to be provided by the European Community and the Atlantic Alliance as far as Western co-operation is concerned, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe as far as all-European co-operation is concerned. It is therefore vitally important that the process of unification should proceed by democratic means, and above all that the new Germany should be a democratic one. Forty years of democracy in the Federal Republic of Germany give us every reason for confidence.

(Mr. van den Broek, Netherlands)

between the United States and the Soviet Union will certainly have a positive effect on the work here in the Conference on Disarmament. I should also like to thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Morel of France, for his tireless efforts over the past year. I wish his successor, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, every success, and assure him that he can count on the full co-operation of the Dutch delegation. We have certainly not yet reached the end of our exercise, but there is a glimmer of light at the end of the tunnel. On the basis of what has already been achieved and the detailed nature of the discussions on virtually every aspect of the chemical weapons treaty, it should be possible to resolve the remaining major issues this year and to wind up the negotiations promptly thereafter. If we demonstrate the political and, I should add, the practical will, this should be feasible, and we will soon be on the home stretch.

Speaking of practical will, I would like to stress how important it is to gain practical experience with the verification system to be established under the convention. In that context, trial inspections have proved to be extremely useful. You are aware of the trial inspection held in a chemical plant in the Netherlands last spring. We now intend to organize a trial challenge inspection in a military installation in the near future. Its results will be communicated to the Conference on Disarmament at an early date.

With the end of the negotiations now, as we hope, in sight, I wish to repeat my offer to host the international organization responsible for the implementation of the chemical weapons treaty in the Netherlands. We propose The Hague, due to its central location and accessibility and because it is the seat of other international organizations such as the International Court of Justice. The Netherlands also has a sophisticated chemical industry and laboratories which can lend assistance. I hope that the conviction and dedication with which my country has continuously supported the negotiations will earn your support. I intend to provide you with the details of the Netherlands offer in the near future. I gather that my friend Alois Mock will be making similar proposals on behalf of Vienna. Consider us to be friendly rivals.

I do not wish to conclude without pointing to the rediscovery and proliferation of a category of weapons which was banned in a treaty over 15 years ago, but which unfortunately seems to have regained its attractiveness for military purposes. I refer to biological weapons. We must combine our utmost efforts and imagination to stop the abhorrent abuse of substances and equipment otherwise used for legitimate purposes. In the Netherlands we are examining the possibility of taking steps at the national level. For some time the Government has been engaged in contacts on this matter with Netherlands-based companies and institutes of international repute which are active in the field of biotechnology. We are now considering the possibility of issuing a paper to raise awareness of this problem among relevant companies and institutes. Further measures cannot be excluded.

It would be highly ironic if these horrific weapons, which we had hoped to banish, were once again to acquire a place in countries' arsenals, at a time when so much progress is being made in many areas of arms control. I fear that we are also paying the price for the absence of a verification mechanism in the biological weapons Convention, which as it stands represents

(Mr. van den Broek, Netherlands)

little more than a political commitment to abandon these weapons. The international community has attempted to close the gap between this commitment and the need to verify compliance with the Treaty to some extent by means of the confidence-building measures drawn up three years ago. The Netherlands contributed to their coming into being. This should not close our eyes for the fact that even if there had been a verification system, water-tight control would still have been extremely difficult, given the ease with which biological weapons can be manufactured in secret.

The third review conference on the biological weapons Convention will be held in September 1991. We should already be reflecting about ways and means of strengthening the treaty and verifying compliance, in order to halt and reverse the continuing proliferation. It is therefore high time that we embarked on international consultations on these matters. I am considering making a Dutch contribution to this process by inviting a number of interested countries to attend a seminar-type conference on this vital issue in the Netherlands.

I have dwelt on some hopeful events - both in the political and in the arms control fields - but also on some discouraging and disquieting developments. The message is clear: arms are still with us in too great a number and, I hasten to add, in many and sometimes new and threatening forms. We should not agree to their being negotiated away from one place to appear subsequently elsewhere; not to speak of the strains being put on the budgets of many of the nations assembled here to the detriment of other pressing needs. It is our collective task to ensure that our planet becomes a safer, juster and healthier place to live. With the necessary determination, this objective should not be beyond our reach. Your contribution in meeting this challenge will be invaluable.

The PRESIDENT: I thank His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands for his important statement and for the kind words that he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria, His Excellency Alois Mock.

Mr. MOCK (Austria) (translated from French): It is with particular pleasure that I convey my congratulations to you, Mr. Minister and dear friend, as the Netherlands takes up the presidency for the month of February. Your presence confirms your country's long-standing commitment to the disarmament process. I am also pleased to greet you as the representative of a country with which Austria has long maintained close and friendly relations, and I thank you warmly for the kind word that you addressed to me by way of welcome. As I am particularly attached to the social market economy, I must accept competition, which I am sure will be very effective and very competent.

We can assert without exaggeration that the world has been transformed in 1989. The advent of a new climate of co-operation in East-West relations, the settlement of regional conflicts, the movement towards democratization in Eastern Europe as well as a vigorous North-South dialogue require a special effort on the part of all political forces involved. We note with pleasure that several States in Eastern Europe have taken the path of parliamentary

(Mr. Mock, Austria)

democracy and the social market economy. In this connection Austria is fully aware of the need for concrete assistance, and will continue to step up its active support.

The Conference on Disarmament is resuming its work at a time when disarmament prospects are highly encouraging. The international political climate favours the conclusion of efforts designed to reduce military confrontation considerably and consolidate peace and stability. Hence it is essential, given this dynamic trend for the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the single global framework for disarmament negotiations, to make an appropriate contribution and enable decisive progress to be accomplished. Here we are thinking first and foremost of the conclusion of work on the convention on the prohibition of the use, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. In this area, several new initiatives were put forward last year. Thus, prospects for the early conclusion of the convention have considerably improved.

In January last year, in Paris, 141 States condemned the use of chemical weapons and emphasized the need to conclude a convention on chemical weapons at an early date. In September 1989, the Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons held in Canberra intensified dialogue on the world scale between government and industry representatives and clearly showed the chemical industry's full support for the future convention.

Bilaterally, the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the United States and the USSR, Messrs. Baker and Shevardnadze, in Wyoming, led to real progress. On that occasion, the Ministers reached agreement in the area of data exchange and trial inspections in advance of the conclusion of a convention. Subsequently, we learned with keen interest of the proposals that President Bush tabled in his address to the forty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We believe that his statement and the favourable reaction of the Soviet Foreign Minister constitute an encouraging sign. Lastly, we would mention the great significance of the meeting between Presidents Bush and Gorbachev in Malta.

Given this wealth of ideas and initiatives, we share the view of those who consider 1990 to be a crucial year for decisive progress in negotiations, particularly on the question of chemical weapons. The hope of arriving at a convention on the prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction, is shared well beyond the ranks of the 40 member States of the Conference on Disarmament, who have for many years been working on the drafting of this specific and complex agreement. The effectiveness of this convention depends to a major extent on the widest possible participation. Austria believes that all States that so wish should be granted the opportunity to participate in the drawing up of the convention, as has been stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and in the Paris Declaration. This alone can offer an assurance that the text of the convention will take account of all specific concerns.

Concurrently, we believe that it is of particular value to the future convention to conduct an exchange of appropriate data in advance in order to promote mutual trust and the early signature of the convention by the greatest possible number of States. In this context, I have pleasure in announcing

(Mr. Mock, Austria)

that Austria will shortly be submitting two working papers to the Conference: a complete report on the trial inspection conducted in autumn 1989 at a chemical industry facility, and updated data on chemical industry production. Austria is prepared to do its utmost to contribute to the early conclusion of the chemical weapons convention.

Complete and effective verification of the convention remains the principal difficulty in the negotiations. The purpose of any system of rules should be to arrive at a degree of monitoring that precludes the production or stockpiling of militarily significant quantities of chemical weapons. This purpose seems capable of achievement. The need for effective verification should not, however, delay the conclusion of our work. This means, in our view, that certain limitations upon the monitoring of the convention should be accepted. In other words, we should weigh the wish for effective verification against the need for the early conclusion of this work. Reports of the growing proliferation of chemical weapons clearly show that time is working against us.

The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, as a body of member States responsible for monitoring compliance with contractual obligations, will have to perform essential and very specific tasks. Hence the composition of its decision-making bodies is of particular importance, and should take account of political and geographical criteria, as well as criteria relating to the volume of chemical industry production. Austria recognizes the considerable importance of this organization. Two years ago in this very forum I first indicated that Austria was prepared to host this organization. Bearing in mind the progress achieved in the negotiations, I should now like to make this a concrete offer. In making this proposal and inviting the future Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons to Vienna, Austria also hopes to give new impetus to the negotiations regarding the structure and functions of the organization. This invitation issued on behalf of Austria, a neutral State in perpetuity, is fully in harmony with its consistent policy of peace and international co-operation. My country has already shown in the past that it was prepared to contribute to the work of international organizations, not only in a general way but also in a specific way. This was demonstrated, for example, in the construction of the Vienna International Centre, home to the official headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Office at Vienna and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. The Vienna International Centre was entirely financed by Austria and is made available to its users for a token rent of one schilling per year.

Austria is prepared to host the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons on identical terms to those granted to the organizations which have already installed themselves in the Vienna International Centre. Firstly, Austria will make available to the organization adequate premises for the staff required during the preparatory phase, during the chemical weapon destruction phase and during the subsequent phase of permanent monitoring. Austria intends to make available to the organization initially a provisional headquarters with offices accommodating between 450 and 600 persons. This building, located in the centre of Vienna and with a net surface of 6,300 square metres, would be renovated and made available to the organization free of charge. Once the expected size of the organization is known, it is

(Mr. Mock, Austria)

planned to construct a new building at the Vienna International Centre or in its immediate neighbourhood to house it permanently. For this permanent headquarters Austria would also provide the land and bear the construction costs of the building.

Secondly, in order to place the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons on an equal footing with the international organizations already in Vienna, Austria would grant the organization and its staff the same privileges and immunities as those enjoyed by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Office at Vienna and other similar organizations.

Thirdly, in the event that the conferences of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons were too large to be held at the organization's headquarters or at the Vienna International Centre, Austria would bear the cost of hiring appropriate conference rooms. In the course of the spring session of the Conference on Disarmament, Austria will submit a working paper containing details of this offer.

To highlight Austria's interest in an early solution to outstanding questions relating to the convention on chemical weapons, but also within the context of the possible establishment of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons in Vienna, the federal Government has adopted a programme of research on the verification and monitoring of the chemical weapons convention. Funding of 3 million schillings has been made available for this programme for the current budgetary year. This initiative will enable us, on the one hand, to set up a highly qualified group of experts in monitoring of chemical weapons and, on the other, to draw up proposed solutions in the negotiating areas that remain outstanding. These proposals could be submitted to the Committee on Chemical Weapons.

Austria makes this offer as a State observing permanent neutrality and in its capacity as a host country for organizations and international conferences. We seek in this way to contribute to closer co-operation between States. My country also sees this offer as the continuation and logical consequence of the tireless efforts that it has been pursuing for decades for peace and disarmament in the world. In this connection I should like to recall that 30 years ago Austria participated for the first time in United Nations peace-keeping operations. Thousands of Austrian soldiers have participated in such United Nations operations. In 1988 the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to pay tribute to this United Nations commitment. Austria's policy in this field was confirmed at the international level by the establishment in Vienna of the third headquarters office of the United Nations. The new Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons could also benefit from the international profile of Vienna and the infrastructure built up in our capital over a period of more than 10 years. The organization would enjoy numerous advantages: the possibility of direct communications with the United Nations system; the possibility of pooling experience with IAEA, an organization established in Vienna since 1957, which has acquired a vast stock of knowledge regarding inspection missions; the possibility of realizing savings through the shared use of technical facilities; and work facilitated by long experience of international conferences and the requisite human and technical resources. The future staff will enjoy the professional and personal advantages that can be offered by a city which has been open to

(Mr. Mock, Austria)

international life for many years. I might mention the existence of 10 international schools, with instruction in 8 languages, 3 foreign-language theatres, and also the presence of churches and places of worship belonging to 10 religions. Finally, I should like to add that the opening up of the borders between East and West is particularly tangible in Vienna, and this in itself constitutes a factor conducive to international disarmament efforts.

The recent welcome progress achieved in the area of disarmament is also to be observed in other exchanges which are under way in Vienna: I am referring to the talks on confidence- and security-building measures and the negotiations on conventional armed forces in Europe.

In view of the very effective competition from the Netherlands it is quite clear that I have had to advance very detailed arguments.

Allow me to conclude my comments on chemical weapons with a brief comment on the forty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We welcome with satisfaction the report of the group of experts on procedures for verification in the event of the use of chemical weapons, and we view it as an invaluable instrument which could serve as a basis for measures to be taken by the United Nations Secretary-General. In the area of biological weapons the delegation of your country, Mr. Minister, and the delegation of Australia, as well as our delegation, closely co-operated at the General Assembly and successfully redrafted the United Nations General Assembly resolution on this issue. Bearing in mind the Austrian chairmanship of the second review conference in 1986, which was crowned with success, and thinking ahead to the next review conference in 1991, we attach considerable importance to the results achieved in New York, and to active preparation for this conference.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space remains one of the major concerns of the community of States. We believe that the verification of arms control agreements or disarmament agreements should constitute the sole military use of space. The disclosure of other military activities in space would constitute a great step forward towards the achievement of this objective. We regret that no progress was made in this area in 1989. The progress made in the bilateral talks between the two super-Powers towards a START agreement is a positive sign in our view, and we hope that the forthcoming summit between Presidents Bush and Gorbachev will permit further movement in that direction. At the same time we welcome the implementation of the "open skies" concept.

The conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty remains a priority goal on the international disarmament agenda. Although in 1989 it was not possible to set up a committee within the Conference on Disarmament, we hope that this year it will be possible to agree on a mandate. Austria fully appreciates the work of the Group of Seismic Experts, which is to develop a model international seismic data exchange system. Since the first phase, namely the large-scale test, was completed in 1989, we hope that the second and third phases will demonstrate the satisfactory operation of an international monitoring system. Austria will continue its sustained participation in the work of the Group of Experts, and will make the necessary information available to it at the current stage of the work.

(Mr. Mock, Austria)

In 1990 Geneva will once again host an international conference to review the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This fourth review conference will begin in August, and will also have to consider the question of the validity of the Treaty after 1995. This Treaty is, in our view, an important guarantee of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Its lasting success is without any doubt closely related to specific steps in the area of nuclear disarmament. Austria will actively participate in this forthcoming review conference, and we hope it will be possible for us to arrive at an early consensus on the validity of the Treaty after 1995.

The fact that Austria's detailed offer to host the headquarters of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons is being presented at this specific moment bears witness to our optimism regarding the early conclusion of the negotiations.

In conclusion, I should like to thank the Conference on Disarmament, and in particular your delegation, Mr. Minister, for having made the necessary arrangements for my personal participation, and I offer the Conference on Disarmament my warmest wishes for success in its work in 1990.

The PRESIDENT: I thank His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria for his important statement and for the kind words that he addressed to the Chair. His Excellency the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands regrets that he has to leave us, but he has to address the Commission on Human Rights immediately. I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Marín Bosch.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I should like to assure the distinguished Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands and Austria, whom we are pleased to see in this room today, that the Government of Mexico is not seeking to host the international organization which will be responsible for implementing the future chemical weapons convention.

Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to congratulate you upon taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. February has been an especially important month in the work of this negotiating forum, since during this stage the scope of the programme of work for the whole year is usually defined more precisely. We count on you to get our work in 1990 off to a good start, and we offer you the full co-operation of the Mexican delegation. I should like also to put on record our gratitude to the distinguished Ambassador of Morocco, El Ghali Benhima, for the way in which he conducted the work of the Conference during last September and the inter-sessional period.

It is also a pleasure to see Ambassador Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference, and Ambassador Berasategui, Deputy Secretary-General, who, together with the other members of the secretariat, make a valuable contribution to our work. The presence of Under-Secretary-General Akashi here today underlines his dedication to the cause of disarmament.

I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for the words of welcome you addressed to the new representatives to the Conference, among which I have the honour to be included.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

Bearing in mind the changing international situation and the importance that the Government of Mexico attributes to the work that has been assigned to us, allow me to read the message that President Carlos Salinas de Gortari has addressed to the Conference:

"Today the Conference on Disarmament is once again taking up its important task, at a time of renewed hope in disarmament. The United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have begun talks and negotiations on a number of issues, beginning with nuclear disarmament, and the community of nations is witnessing the emergence of fresh and encouraging developments in the search for international peace and security.

"The Conference on Disarmament now has before it a major opportunity to translate this climate of détente into specific agreements on the priority issues: nuclear disarmament, and more particularly the cessation of all nuclear tests, and the elimination of chemical weapons.

"Disarmament has been under discussion at the Palais des Nations in Geneva for over a half a century. We ought now to move forward along the path marked out by the United Nations to achieve a safer world with fewer weapons. The ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control remains as valid today as it was in 1962 when this Conference began its work.

"As members of the Conference on Disarmament, all of us have a duty and an obligation to fulfil the hopes of the peoples of the world, to banish the spectre of war and its deadly instruments. The bilateral understandings should be followed by disarmament agreements negotiated on a multilateral basis. The most pressing issue is the total suspension of nuclear tests. A number of possibilities are open to us in order to achieve that objective.

"The elimination of chemical weapons is also a matter of priority. The international community is entitled to demand the rapid conclusion of a convention in this field. We need to draw up a comprehensive programme of disarmament to serve as a framework of our efforts. Not one of us, moreover, is unaware of the close link between disarmament and economic development.

"We have instructed our delegation to the Conference to maintain Mexico's constructive contribution towards achieving the objectives we have all set ourselves and to strive to strengthen the role of the United Nations in this field of such vital importance to mankind.

"I should now like to take this opportunity to say a few words to the Conference about a great Mexican who is well known to all of you.

"The Government of Mexico will shortly be paying a national tribute to Mr. Alfonso García Robles. On behalf of the people and Government of Mexico, I should like here and now to express our gratitude to Ambassador Emeritus García Robles for his tireless devotion in defending

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

the guiding principles of our foreign policy. Those principles correspond to those in the Charter of the United Nations, an organization he served for 10 years as an international official.

"His involvement in this Conference began almost a quarter of a century ago, on 21 February 1967, when he presented the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which had been opened for signature in Mexico City a week before. It was quite natural that the presentation should have been the responsibility of the then Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, as he had led Mexico's efforts to evolve a legal instrument embodying Latin America's aspiration to become a nuclear-free zone. He subsequently participated actively and without interruption in the annual sessions of the Conference on Disarmament: first of all as Under-Secretary, then as Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York, and in 1976 as Minister for Foreign Affairs. From 1977 onwards, he became Permanent Representative to the Conference itself.

"In 1982 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize together with Mrs. Alva Myrdal of Sweden. Today we wish to assure him once again of our respect, recognition and gratitude."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement, and for transmitting the important message addressed to the Conference by His Excellency the President of Mexico, in which he expresses recognition of the outstanding contribution made by Ambassador Emeritus García Robles to the cause of disarmament. As I have had occasion to state before, the Conference joins in the tribute paid by the President of Mexico to Ambassador García Robles. I also thank the representative of Mexico for the kind words that he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden, Ambassador Theorin, whom I welcome to the Conference.

Mrs. THEORIN (Sweden): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to welcome you to the Conference on Disarmament and to congratulate you on taking up your important duties during the crucial first month of the Conference. I am sure that with your long experience in the field of disarmament, you will be able to guide the work of this Conference in a very constructive and productive manner, and I pledge the full support of the Swedish delegation in your efforts. At the same time, I wish to thank your predecessor as President of the Conference, Ambassador Benhima, for having - with his well-known diplomatic skills and experience - brought the previous session of the Conference to a successful conclusion. I wish to extend a warm welcome to our new Ambassadors in the CD, Ambassadors Rasaputram of Sri Lanka, Ogada of Kenya, Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Hou Zhitong of China, Donowaki of Japan, Shannon of Canada, García Moritán of Argentina and Arteaga of Venezuela, and Ambassador Ledogar of the United States. I would like to use this occasion to express my appreciation and gratitude to Ambassador García Robles of Mexico. Although you are unable to be in our midst today,

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

(continued in Spanish)

dear Alfonso, I would like to assure you that we will miss you as you cease your duties in the United Nations Conference on Disarmament and take leave of all the friends you have here. I hope and do not doubt that we will meet again in the future and that we will thus be able to continue drawing on your experience and wisdom in your quest for disarmament and peace.

(continued in English)

A life-long devotion to the cause of disarmament and multilateral affairs has made Ambassador García Robles the dean and unswerving inspirer in our midst. With a formidable record of professional achievement he has made an outstanding contribution to the noble cause of disarmament. Ambassador García Robles played a decisive role in connection with the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The same was true for the first special session devoted to disarmament and its Final Document. His name has been intimately linked with this august body. He made an important contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign. Ambassador García Robles also served as Foreign Minister of his country and, furthermore, he has been a member of the Palme Commission and participated very actively in the Six-nation Initiative. Together with my compatriot, Alva Myrdal, Ambassador García Robles was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1982. I welcome your successor and close collaborator, Ambassador Marín Bosch, upon his return to the CD, this time as the leader of the Mexican delegation, and I feel assured that the traditional close co-operation in disarmament affairs between Mexico and Sweden will fruitfully continue.

I listened with great interest to the statements made by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands and Austria and to the statement made by the Ambassador of Mexico. Their statements will be carefully studied by my delegation.

Ours is a time of rapid political change. Let us for a moment imagine ourselves five or six years back in time. Who could have envisaged the political metamorphosis that the world is currently experiencing when the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe was opened in the Swedish capital six years ago? If anyone had then prophesied developments like those we are now witnessing, he or she would have been scorned as a dreamer, a romantic out of touch with reality. But reality has outdone fiction. Many of us will recall the lyrics of the American poet and musician Bob Dylan, singing of another tumultuous period in our lifetime:

"The slow one now
Will later be fast
As the present now
Will later be past
The order is
Rapidly fadin'.
And the first one now
Will later be last
For the times they are a-changin'."

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

The times are indeed changing. 1988 was the year peace broke out. 1989 was the year of democratization. There is a widely held expectation that 1990 will become the year of disarmament. It is incumbent upon us to ensure that the Conference on Disarmament does its share to meet this expectation. Disarmament is not a romantic dream. We can make it a reality. Let us allow new expectations to be met by new concrete action. Let the Conference on Disarmament truly play the role for which it was created.

Without exaggerating, we may speak of a turning-point in world politics. The political about-face in Eastern Europe is most dramatic, of course. First, glasnost and perestroika in the Soviet Union, then drastic unilateral Soviet and East European disarmament undertakings, and, above all, the massive wave of democratization last autumn. What is particularly satisfying is that, with one exception, all of this has been brought about as a result of peaceful, popular, political mobilization. A new Europe is emerging, a Europe that has left the cold war behind. A Europe of democracy, progress and common security.

In building peace, we must abolish the tools of war. And disarmament has already made some progress, in line with the improved political climate. In December 1987 the Soviet Union and the United States concluded the first nuclear disarmament agreement in history - the INF Treaty - and are now in the process of physically destroying land-based intermediate-range nuclear missiles.

A militarily epochal bilateral super-Power agreement on 50 per cent cuts in strategic nuclear weapons is under way. Likewise, an agreement on significant conventional arms reductions in Europe is expected to materialize this year. The super-Powers are negotiating a bilateral agreement to cut back most of their chemical weapon arsenals, as a step towards a global comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. In addition to negotiated disarmament measures, several countries in both East and West - including the Soviet Union and the United States - are now taking unilateral steps to reduce their military forces and restructure them in more defensive postures. Furthermore, President Bush has just proposed significantly larger conventional forces reductions in Europe than those that had been envisaged in Vienna, while some East European countries are negotiating with the Soviet Union on complete troop withdrawals this year.

A curious yet truly fundamental feature of the dynamics of this situation is that the perception that the military threat is dissolving tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Is the upward spiral of the arms race being turned into a downward disarmament spiral?

In order to safeguard a downward disarmament spiral, we must not lean back, content with what has been achieved. On the contrary, we must now take maximum advantage of the current opportunities. We must continue to transcend the entrenched boundaries of what are considered to be politically realistic objectives.

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

While it is still too early to designate 1990 as the year of disarmament, I think one may fairly argue that we are beginning to see the contours of emerging, parallel disarmament measures: negotiated agreements or unilateral undertakings on strategic and other nuclear weapons, on chemical weapons, on conventional forces, on further confidence-building measures.

Regrettably, however, progress in global multilateral disarmament efforts has been slow compared with the recent record of the bilateral talks and the regional European negotiations. To the general public this is an enigma. If the major military Powers are seeking real disarmament, they ought to work actively for global agreements.

Over the last few years, we have become very familiar with the claim that the comprehensive chemical weapons convention will be concluded soon. Such statements cannot credibly be repeated for ever by diplomats, politicians and governments. The "rolling text" is in itself a significant achievement. If there is political will there are no insurmountable obstacles. We must be in a position to say how soon a chemical weapons convention can be expected.

In Sweden's view, the negotiations themselves could be concluded in a year's time, given the political will on all sides. A declared political commitment to reach agreement in a specified time frame has appeared conducive to reaching agreement in other negotiations. A corresponding public commitment to an agreed deadline has been considered in the chemical negotiations.

1989 started under the best auspices. The Paris Conference early last year seemed to have provided the necessary impetus and sense of urgency. My Government was convinced that the Paris Declaration, endorsed by some 150 States, with representation at a high political level, constituted a true commitment to the early conclusion of a chemical weapons ban by all participants. No one has better personified that commitment than the Ad hoc Committee Chairman for 1989, Ambassador Morel. Sweden is grateful for his energy, resourcefulness and unswerving loyalty to the task entrusted to him. We would like to thank him and to acknowledge our appreciation of the achievements made in the negotiations under his chairmanship.

The 1989 results of the chemical negotiations are very valuable. The protocol on inspection procedures, the annex on confidentiality, the annex on chemicals, the inclusion of a practically unbracketed annex I to article VI in the "rolling text", the progress on final clauses and on articles VII and VIII, the first texts on the composition of the Executive Council and the further elaboration of article IX, part 2 - all bear witness to the intensive and fruitful work carried out during 1989.

But however significant these results, they still do not constitute a breakthrough. The Paris Declaration had led us to expect a breakthrough.

We have still not been able to translate our common ground regarding challenge inspections into treaty language. We still do not know what a ad hoc verification system would look like. There is no broadly acceptable formula for the Executive Council's composition and decision-making. There are still widely disparate views on the principle that a total prohibition of

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

use should take effect at the same time as the convention comes into force. To a great extent, solutions to these problems are already available. What is needed is the political will, the commitment and the courage to really negotiate, to make choices, and to compromise.

The greater momentum of the bilateral consultations between the United States and the Soviet Union in 1989 is a good sign. The Committee has benefited from some of the results. Furthermore, one sign of good intentions is the bilateral memorandum of understanding regarding the exchange of data, confidence-building visits and ultimately inspections prior to the signature of the convention. It is disappointing, however, that the bilateral agreement on the order of destruction of chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities, confirmed and announced at the meeting at foreign minister level in Wyoming in September, has not yet been communicated to the Conference on Disarmament.

It seems that the delay is due to the emergency of potentially crippling reservations, which would allow certain States to retain chemical warfare agents until - in their unilateral judgement - all States capable of making chemical weapons subscribe to the convention.

Sweden fully shares the concern about ensuring global adhesion to the chemical weapons convention. However, reservations of this type risk doing the opposite by leaving a glaring loophole in the régime, thereby providing an excuse for other countries to retain - or to acquire - chemical weapons as well. In the Swedish Government's view, it is of vital importance that all States wishing to participate in the negotiations should be allowed to do so in accordance with the 1989 Paris Declaration.

1990 will be a crucial year in the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention. A definite breakthrough must now come.

The non-proliferation Treaty is a cornerstone of the international legal régime in the field of disarmament. It has made a significant contribution to international security for two decades. The renunciation of nuclear weapons through adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty by the vast majority of countries has gradually reinforced the international rejection of nuclear weapons and made non-possession of such weapons an emerging norm of international conduct.

By adhering to the non-proliferation Treaty, 140 States - 137 non-nuclear-weapon States and 3 nuclear-weapon States - have made a commitment to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The nuclear-weapon States parties - the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States - have undertaken to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament. The non-nuclear-weapon States have fulfilled their commitments under the Treaty. The nuclear-weapon States, however, must go far beyond militarily marginal reductions of existing arsenals if their part of the bargain is to be fulfilled.

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

Two factors are of particular importance in ensuring that the Treaty will not be eroded after 1995. Firstly, adherence to the Treaty has to be universal. I therefore urge the two nuclear-weapon States outside the Treaty, as well as all other States not yet parties to the Treaty, to accede to the NPT and participate constructively in the fourth review conference and subsequent efforts to ensure its prolongation beyond 1995.

Secondly, all obligations laid down in the Treaty must be fulfilled. As I have already said, the non-nuclear-weapon States which are parties to the Treaty have done their share. The obvious way for the nuclear-weapon States to honour their commitments under the Treaty and ensure its prolongation would be to drastically reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons and to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty - the key to nuclear disarmament.

A comprehensive test ban is crucial for efforts to end the nuclear arms race. More than a quarter of a century ago, in the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty, three nuclear-weapon States expressed their determination to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time. More than 21 years ago, in the non-proliferation Treaty of 1968, they restated the determination they had expressed five years earlier. Today, more than 26 years after the conclusion of the partial test-ban Treaty, negotiations on a comprehensive test ban have still not commenced.

The minimum contribution of the nuclear-weapon States to the review conference and the prolongation of the Treaty would be to agree to start negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. The demand for a comprehensive test ban is highly topical this year for two reasons. One reason is the review conference regarding the non-proliferation Treaty. Another reason is that efforts are in progress to convene an amendment conference to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. The objective stated is to transform the partial test-ban Treaty - which prohibits nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, but not under ground - into a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is to be hoped that the nuclear-weapon States will correctly assess the political signals emerging from the initiative to convene such an amendment conference. It is to be hoped that they will allow the amendment conference to become the catalyst required to start negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, speedily and in good faith.

For decades, my Government together with the vast majority of States has urged the Conference on Disarmament to initiate such negotiations, and has worked very actively towards this end, but so far in vain. My Government continues to consider such negotiations urgent. In fact, they are acquiring added urgency. And Sweden continues to believe they belong in the Conference on Disarmament.

Now that we have entered a more constructive period in East-West relations, disarmament negotiations will face new opportunities. But the constructive spirit must embrace all aspects of disarmament. Otherwise, there is an obvious risk that limitations in one area will be counteracted by armaments in another. Naval forces form an integral part of overall military force structures. They must therefore be integrated in, not exempt from efforts to achieve disarmament and build confidence. It is essential,

(Mrs. Theorin, Sweden)

therefore, that initiatives related to land-based military forces are accompanied by commensurate measures in the naval area. Given the necessary political will, it is possible to overcome geopolitical and legal differences.

Sea-borne nuclear weapons constitute a global problem which should be integrated in the disarmament process. This matter is an important aspect of the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament - item 2 of our agenda - which has so far not received the attention it deserves in this Conference. Naval confidence-building measures and the modernization of the laws of sea wafare must also be negotiated.

I have stated earlier that the question of the prevention of incidents on the high seas should be put on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. This matter can, and in Sweden's view should, be dealt with in the framework of agenda item 3, Prevention of nuclear war, as incidents at sea may escalate into nuclear conflict. The excessive number of nuclear weapons at sea is causing legitimate public concern world-wide. These feelings are underpinned by the secrecy which traditionally surrounds the deployment of such weapons. Sweden has therefore welcomed the decision by the United States to phase out several types of tactical nuclear sea-borne weapons unilaterally, and has urged the other nuclear-weapon States to follow suit.

We have noted that a discussion in unfolding within the United States on the need to review the policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons on board specific naval vessels. In this context, we note with great interest recent suggestions that the super-Powers should start talks aiming at the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons from surface warships and submarines. I welcome these developments, and would like to recall that my Government supports the proposal that all nuclear weapons should be prohibited on all ships and submarines, other than those classes specifically designated by agreement, as an interim measure in anticipation of the more far-reaching denuclearization of seas and oceans. In the post-war history of disarmament efforts, naval issues have been largely missing. In view of the particular sensitivities surrounding naval forces, I find the ongoing discussion very encouraging.

In the rapidly improved political atmosphere, it stands to reason that prospects for disarmament also improve. We must no longer succumb to the taboos of yesterday. The challenge is to transcend the achievements of today.

"Don't stand in the doorway
Don't block up the hall
For he that gets hurt
Will be he who has stalled"

as Bob Dylan used to sing.

"For the loser now
Will be later to win
For the times they are a-changin'."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Kingdom of Sweden for her statement and for the kind words that she addressed to the Chair. In accordance with my earlier announcement, I now invite the representative of Mexico to take the floor in his capacity as Co-ordinator of the Group of 21.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico): On behalf of the Group of 21, I should like to make the following statement on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

"The commitment of the international community to banning chemical weapons has been emphatically expressed on several occasions in the last year by Governments in unilateral statements as well as in the General Assembly of the United Nations, at the Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and at the Paris Conference, and by governments and industry together at the Canberra Conference. This commitment, and the repeated declarations of political will to this end, must be reflected in our work for 1990.

"It is essential that rapid progress be made on the political issues which are still outstanding, along with progress on technical issues. It is a serious concern of the Group of 21 that the substantive progress on primarily technical issues has not been accompanied by progress on some political issues of great importance to the Group, such as use of chemical weapons, assistance, sanctions and the Executive Council. A proper balance must also be established between rights and obligations for all the future parties to the Convention, in order to secure universal adherence to this important instrument of international law. This must be clearly reflected in the negotiations if they are to lead to a successful conclusion, thereby ridding the world of the threat of use of these awesome weapons of mass destruction.

"The conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons, which took place in Paris between 7 and 11 January 1989, in its Final Declaration, adopted unanimously by all participating States, stressed the urgency and the priority of the task entrusted to the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and called on the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva 'to redouble its efforts, as a matter of urgency, to resolve expeditiously the remaining issues and to conclude the convention at the earliest date'.

"At the Government-Industry Conference held in Canberra from 18 to 22 September last year, the urgency of concluding a convention totally banning chemical weapons was further underlined.

"On 15 December 1989, the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly unanimously adopted two resolutions which refer to the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Resolution 44/115 A, on 'Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons' expresses the regret of the General Assembly that 'a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction has not yet been concluded'. It 'again urges the Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to intensify, during its 1990 session, which will be of pivotal importance, the negotiations on such a convention and to reinforce its efforts further

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

by, inter alia, increasing the time that it devotes to such negotiations, taking into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, with a view to the final elaboration of a convention at the earliest date, and to re-establish its Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for that purpose with the mandate to be agreed upon by the Conference at the beginning of its 1990 session'. Resolution 44/115 B, on 'Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to support the conclusion of a chemical weapons convention', specifically 'urges the Conference on Disarmament to pursue as a matter of continuing urgency its negotiations on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons and on their destruction'.

"Thus, less than two months ago, the General Assembly emphasized the urgency of the negotiations on the CW convention and urged this Conference to negotiate with a view to its final elaboration. The General Assembly also stressed that the convention should embrace inter alia the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons. All these points must be reflected in the mandate for the negotiations.

"The Group of 21 therefore continues to believe that the mandate to be adopted by this forum should include a reference to the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons, in order to be consistent with the General Assembly resolutions 44/115 A and B and with the language enshrined in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. The phrase 'except for its final drafting' should be deleted from the text of the mandate in order to convey to the international community our full acceptance of the responsibility entrusted to the Ad hoc Committee as contained in the three texts referred to above, which the States represented here adhered to without exception. As the General Assembly and the Paris Conference stated, the negotiations should be concluded at the earliest date. This must be clearly expressed in the mandate.

"The Group would like to emphasize the importance it attaches to all the aspects of the mandate and the conduct of the negotiations which have been outlined in this statement."

(continued in Spanish)

Finally, in my capacity as representative of Mexico, allow me to voice my very sincere thanks for the kind words concerning Ambassador García Robles expressed by you, Mr President, and the distinguished representative of Sweden, Ambassador Theorin.

The PRESIDENT: That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not. As agreed during our informal consultations, I shall now suspend the plenary meeting and, in three minutes' time, convene an informal meeting of the Conference to consider the agenda and programme of work for the 1990 session, the re-establishment of subsidiary bodies and requests for participation received from States not members of the Conference.

The meeting was suspended at 12.20 p.m. and resumed at 12.30 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 532nd plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed. We shall now proceed to formalize the agreements reached at the informal meeting on a number of organizational questions.

I put before the Conference on Disarmament for decision working paper CD/WP.375, on the agenda for the 1990 session and the programme of work for its first part. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts this draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: We shall now take up working paper CD/WP.376 concerning the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I now turn to the appointment of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. I understand that the Conference agrees to appoint Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy in that capacity.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I now turn to working paper CD/WP.377, relating to a draft decision on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put before the Conference the appointment of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. I note that there is consensus on appointing Ambassador István Varga of Hungary as presiding officer.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Conference, I extend our congraulations to Ambassadors Negrotto Cambiaso and Varga on their important appointments. We wish them every success in discharging the heavy responsibilities facing them. I note that His Excellency the Ambassador of Italy has asked for the floor.

Mr. NEGROTTO CAMBIASO (Italy): Mr. President, allow me to express to you my sincere congratulations on taking up the presidency in this important opening month of the Conference, and my warm gratitude to Ambassador Benhima of Morocco for the excellent work he accomplished. I am more than confident, Mr. President, that thanks to your reliable guidance and experience the Conference on Disarmament will be able to embark fruitfully on the crucial undertakings ahead. I also wish to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for the warm words of welcome that have been addressed to me as the new representative of Italy in the CD.

(Mr. Negrotto Cambiaso, Italy)

I would very much like to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the distinguished members of the Conference, for the confidence that has been placed in me and my delegation through my appointment to the Chair of the Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons. We are aware that we are living in a particularly important time, witnessing events which raise our expectations of progress and better understanding in many fields, as was well pointed out in the message from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, as well as in the message from the President of Mexico and by the eminent figures who have addressed this body today. As to the specific field covered by this Ad hoc Committee, we are confident that in spite of the lack of substantial progress so far, the prospects for movement ahead on the issue depend very much on the efforts and good will that all of us will be able to contribute. My task, first of all, will be to proceed with the utmost pragmatism and openness, well aware of the difficulties but also of the chances made available by the new outlook in East-West relations. Therefore, dear colleagues, I will ask to be received in the coming days by each and every one of you, in order to collect from you suggestions and views on substantive and procedural questions. I will subsequently submit to you a programme of work.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Ambassador of Italy, and note that His Excellency the Ambassador of Hungary has asked for the floor.

Mr. VARGA (Hungary): First of all, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate you on taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and to join Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso who has already expressed his good wishes to you. I would just like to thank the Conference on Disarmament through you, Mr. President, for the confidence they have invested in me as the Chairman of the Radiological Committee. I pledge my efforts to move work forward in the Committee on Radiological Weapons with a view to reaching agreement on a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished Ambassador of Hungary for his statement. I should now like to give the floor to the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ambassador Komatina, who will make a statement in connection with the services available to the Conference.

Mr. KOMATINA (Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations): Mr. President, I will not take long, as I have nothing new to report.

As the members of the Conference know, the United Nations continues to face a financial emergency. As in previous sessions, the Conference needs to implement the target reduction of 30 per cent in services allocated to it. That reduction will again apply to the number of weekly meetings. As was also the case in 1989, this will mean, in practice, the allocation to the Conference of 10 meetings per week with full servicing - 15 meetings per week with full services during the sessions of the Seismic Group. In other words,

(Mr. Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

we will have scope for two daily meetings with full servicing throughout the whole of the 1990 session, plus one additional daily meeting when the Seismic Group is in session.

As the work of the Conference proceeds, it may be necessary to hold meetings of subsidiary bodies consecutively with other committees or working groups. This practice has already been put into effect in the past, and has prevented the waste of allocated resources in cases where the full three hours allocated for each meeting have not been fully utilized. In this respect, punctuality in starting meetings of the Conference is also important. I note that we are not using all the services assigned to us. For your information, in 1989 the Conference and its subsidiary bodies lost 76 hours and 55 minutes as a result of late starting of its meetings, 223 hours and 30 minutes as a result of early ending and 93 hours because of meetings cancelled. That makes almost 400 hours lost.

It is also understood that meetings with full services cannot be held in the evening or during weekends.

I also wish to remind you that measures accepted by the Conference at the informal meeting held on 22 April 1986 concerning documentation continue to be valid. In order to implement these decisions and bring about savings in the cost of documentation, all papers need to be presented in good time.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for his statement. During our consultations, I noted that the members agree to the arrangments described by Ambassador Komatina. We shall therefore proceed accordingly.

I have no other business to consider today. If no delegates wish to take the floor, I intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 8 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

...ING DEPT.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.533
8 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 8 February 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

GE.90-60137/1544B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 533rd plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference will listen to statements and continue to deal with a number of organizational questions. In accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

When we reach the end of our list of speakers today, I intend to suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting for the consideration of various organizational questions, including requests for participation from States not members of the Conference. Immediately afterwards, we shall resume the plenary meeting for any decisions that we may need to formalize.

I have on my list of speakers today the representatives of Egypt, Brazil and Argentina. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Egypt, Ambassador Elaraby.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt): It gives me great pleasure to see you, Sir, presiding over the Conference on Disarmament. Your extensive diplomatic experience, including your previous association with the Conference on Disarmament, reassures us that our deliberations will be ably and wisely conducted during this crucial month at the beginning of the spring session. I also wish to extend a warm welcome to the new Ambassadors who have joined us, starting with you, Mr. President, as the representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Hou of China, Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States and Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela. I wish them all success in their new assignments.

I take the floor today, very briefly, to present to the Conference on Disarmament a report on the national trial inspection carried out by Egypt. The report is contained in document CD/958 of 23 January 1990. The trial inspection was conducted at one of our chemical plants in a Cairo suburb at the end of last summer. The principal objectives of the trial inspection were to verify whether data on the production and processing of the chemical substance covered by the inspection were consistent with the records; that the facility was not being used to produce any chemical listed in schedules [1] or [2]; and that the reaction could not be stopped at a specific stage with a view to producing another chemical listed in schedules [1] or [2].

In the course of the national trial inspection it became clear that several provisions of the draft convention concerning verification by inspection on a routine basis require further study. Other questions also arose with regard to access to confidential information and protection of confidentiality. The report contains a list of these issues. I wish to add that my delegation is ready to discuss this trial inspection with other delegations in the Conference on Disarmament with a view to improving procedures for genuine routine inspections.

I shall be asking for the floor at a later stage to express my delegation's views on the items on our agenda.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for his statement and for the kind words that he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Brazil, Ambassador Azambuja.

Mr. AZAMBUJA (Brazil): First of all allow me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on taking up the presidency of the Conference for this month of February, the period we know to be usually burdened with some difficult issues which I am sure, with your well-known diplomatic skills, you will be able to overcome expeditiously. I also take this opportunity to thank Ambassador Benhima of Morocco again for his achievement as President for the preceding period, a long and difficult one when we discussed and adopted our report to the General Assembly.

I have a long list of names of colleagues who have left us and new colleagues who have joined us. You will allow me, Sir, to read the names. I would like to say how much I will miss the company and the advice of Ambassador de Montigny Marchand of Canada, Ambassador Max Friedersdorf of the United States, Ambassador Chusei Yamada of Japan, Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela and Ambassador Aldo Pugliese of Italy. I wish them every success in their new assignments. They left their mark and made a tangible contribution. By the same token I would like to seize this opportunity to welcome very warmly Ambassador Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States, Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela, Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico and Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China.

I have not included the name of Ambassador García Robles in the list of colleagues whose departure I note with regret. I think it will be easy for all of us to understand why I applied such positive discrimination, based exclusively on merit, on achievement and on a unique lifelong dedication to the cause of peace and disarmament. Ambassador García Robles deserves a singular and separate mention at this juncture. He made all of us Latin Americans proud of our region and of our common cultural heritage and shared humanistic values. Ambassador Marín Bosch, who comes from the same excellent school of Mexican diplomacy, will be kind enough, I am sure, to convey our words to the old maestro with the expression of my constant respect. The Nobel Peace Prize recognizes his achievements. Another distinction will be his presence in the memories of those who worked with him on any of the sides of this table, and came to learn from him, as I had the privilege to do over such a long period, almost 30 years from the early stages of work on what was to become the Treaty of Tlatelolco. I wish him all personal happiness, health and a very fruitful retirement.

I could not conclude my introduction without mentioning the pleasure of seeing again the presence of Under-Secretary-General Akashi in our midst. He brings to us the words from New York, the energy, the enthusiasm and his constant commitment to our cause. I would also like to express my thanks to Ambassador Miljan Komatina and Ambassador Vicente Berasategui and all their staff for their very valuable work on our behalf.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

I am very glad to have been given this opportunity to address the Conference on Disarmament at the very outset of our 1990 calendar. I would just like to make a few observations on behalf of the Brazilian Government on the work before us and its relationship to what is going on outside this magnificent room. I will also address today the present stage of the negotiations on a chemical weapons convention, leaving to another occasion the remaining and equally relevant items of our agenda.

There can be no doubt that 1989 was a crucial year. It has been considered by most actors, witnesses and analysts as marking the end of the cold war and also the end of the long cycle of connected events and attitudes that have prevailed since shortly after the conclusion of the Second World War. Some scholars and commentators go even further. They see 1989 as the conclusion of the twentieth century as a coherent historical period. Were it so ours would be remembered as a particularly short "historical" century, since it is universally considered to have begun only in 1914. Other commentators would strike a note of caution here. They would warn us not to be carried away by the flood of good news coming out of our television screens and newspaper headlines, and would advise us to avoid being enthusiastic or over-optimistic.

They certainly have a point inasmuch as the evident aspirations to peace of the peoples and the leaders of the States which were formerly directly engaged in the cold war have yet to take firm shape in new disarmament agreements, the progressive dismantling of military alliances and more substantial reductions in military expenditure. At the same time, we all hope that this note of cautious optimism will be modified by future developments, for this whole new process itself is obviously just at its beginning.

We can say - at this stage - that by all accounts we stand at a threshold. Because some of the major conflicts have been resolved or have been superseded by events, the immediate past allows a rather clear and sharp retrospect. The immediate future seems more promising than at any other point during the last 40 years or so. The tempo of political developments related in one way or another to the so-called East/West conflict, be it in Europe or elsewhere, has achieved the vigour and speed that seemed in recent decades to be the hallmark of scientific and technological progress. Many new ideas and concrete proposals have emerged which suggest that in the world of political values, which are so difficult to assess objectively, steps forward can now be clearly identified and perceptions shared.

It is only natural that this unmatched period of dialogue and co-operation between the super-Powers should bring about solutions to many of the regional problems or conflicts which were, in many cases, basically a local expression of the rivalry between the two major international actors. There are, however, situations that have their roots in other causes, be it of a historical, political, ethnic-religious or socio-economic nature, producing tensions, thriving on poverty and misery and all their dire attendant consequences. These problems and situations have proven to be much more resistant to accommodations deriving from the major Powers' entente.

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

These unwelcome but persistent realities must necessarily qualify the optimism now pervading the international scene at the end of this century, particularly from the point of view of the developing world. The same decade that concluded two months ago and witnessed such extraordinary political achievements has been accurately called, for the developing world and my own region in particular, the "lost decade". For most of the third world, in the crucial dimension of social and economic achievement, these have been largely wasted years.

After this short but necessary digression, to remind us that all is not rosy outside this room, allow me to return to my main theme. When all is said and done, this year begins under the most brilliant auspices for this the sole multilateral negotiating forum for disarmament. In past years the frustrations of multilateral disarmament efforts were somewhat matched by the stalemate and parallel frustrations of bilateral super-Power diplomacy in this same area. Now, with the tangible step forward made in 1987, with the INF Treaty, and with hopes of a major strategic disarmament treaty - at the bilateral level - and a conventional disarmament agreement - at the regional level - in Europe, the absence of any major achievement coming from this body will be difficult to explain or justify to the international community. The inability, up to now, of the same major players that have broken new ground in their bilateral negotiations and are prodding the Viennna talks to a fruitful conclusion to bring the same sense of urgency to our endeavours is rather perplexing.

One of the possible interpretations could be that, whether at the collective and historical level or at the individual and psychological level, it is very difficult to respond appropriately to "answered prayers". For a very long while, especially in some critical areas of the world, States have distrusted each other and prepared for the worst scenarios. For an equally long time effective verification was used as a pre-condition for significant disarmament agreements and, since some were not enthusiastic about its intrusiveness and pervasiveness, the whole disarmament process - bilateral or multilateral - was bogged down. Now that confrontation along East/West lines has abated and verification has been accepted as a major ingredient in any disarmament or arms limitation agreement, it is as if unexpected success and a dramatic change of circumstances have had a paralysing effect on some of us.

It is our common duty, by any yardstick, to break out of this bewilderment and react purposefully to the new international situation. We cannot go on conducting business, here and elsewhere, unduly emotionally attached to our old assumptions, rituals and routines. It is quite clear that we must look very hard into our practices and objectives, adapt them, where necessary, to the new times and do so urgently and thoroughly. It is equally clear that, both structurally and conceptually, this body, this Conference, is a child of the cold war. How can our Conference adapt to the new times? How can we reflect in its structure and procedures a world undergoing rapid change? How can we channel into the multilateral disarmament negotiating body the forces that are knocking down walls and opening minds and frontiers?

(Mr. Azambuja, Brazil)

our structure and ways of doing business; the tireless work done by the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in the 1989-1990 session and the great hopes we can have for its future work, if the negotiators keep in mind the need to succeed in a reasonable time frame.

My two main themes this morning are linked in a multiple way. New thinking should lead to more trust and consequently to the more speedy completion of a CW convention, banning for ever this abhorrent means of warfare. The success of this body in negotiating a multilateral convention of such importance would also, in turn, reinforce trends towards a more harmonious and peaceful international scene. Let us pursue these two objectives simultaneously - the modernization of our working methods and the completion of our first multilateral disarmament agreement in many years. My delegation will contribute to the best of its ability to the attainment of these worthy and urgent objectives.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Brazil for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Argentina, Ambassador García Moritán.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): It is a great pleasure, Sir, to return to the Conference on Disarmament under your presidency. A few years ago I had the opportunity of working with you in the then Committee on Disarmament, and I am familiar with the diplomatic skill you possess to set the pace international circumstances require at the outset of the session. I should also like to express to your predecessor as President, Ambassador Benhima, my delegation's gratitude for the way in which he rounded off the session and for his work in that capacity at the United Nations General Assembly. The presence of the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Akashi, enables me to thank him for the valuable help he provides in the consideration of substantive matters. I should like to take this opportunity to mention my particular debt of gratitude towards the secretariat, and to extend my special appreciation to the Secretary-General, Ambassador Komatina, the Deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Berasategui, and all the staff for the constant and efficient assistance they lend to this negotiating body. I regret that Aida Levin is no longer with us. I know that it would have pleased her to see me performing these new duties.

The President of Mexico's statement, conveyed to this forum by his Ambassador, highlights the significance of our task and the gratitude that we all owe to a man who has turned his life into a struggle for the cause of disarmament. It is not necessary to mention his name, nor do I make so bold as to recall the course of his career. I would simply like to point out that those of us who have been his disciples, those of us who have been his colleagues and are his friends will try to keep aloft the multilateral banner that Alfonso García Robles hoisted over 40 years ago.

In my first statement before the Conference on Disarmament I have the satisfaction of reading the following special message addressed to this body by the President of Argentina, Carlos S. Menem:

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

"On the occasion of the appointment of a new Permanent Representative of my country to the Conference on Disarmament, I would like to share some brief thoughts with the delegations of member States.

"The world seems to be increasingly guided by a more sensible and rational logic. A universalist concept is gaining ground over the ideological rigidity that has so far characterized the present century.

"It is the responsibility of East and West, North and South to contribute to the enhancement of processes of political negotiation. The time has come for common action. Individual security will only be complete if the security of others is duly taken into account.

"In the field of disarmament it is the bounden duty of us all, without any exceptions, to elaborate the multilateral undertakings that will reinforce and give universal coherence to the positive steps taken by the Presidents of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"It is precisely this negotiating body, the only multilateral forum resulting from universal consensus, which must generate the indispensable measures pertaining to issues which by their very nature cannot be limited to the bilateral level.

"Weapons of mass destruction continue to be the highest priority. Nuclear weapons must disappear from the military lexicon, and the positive negotiations already under way must take account of the fact that a stable and permanent peace should embrace all types of such weapons and all States possessing them. This organ must contribute to that end.

"The convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons which is being drafted by this Conference must not be delayed. It is time our negotiators found the formulae that will enable us to harmonize all our positions and deal with outstanding issues as soon as possible. I have given clear instructions in this regard to the Permanent Representative of my country in those negotiations.

"The prevention of an arms race in outer space is another area that must be tackled with renewed commitment. A sphere that must be reserved for the common welfare of mankind cannot be subjected to power politics.

"Our entire environment needs our attention. We cannot continue neglecting issues that affect our present and future security and in the same context also endanger the survival of man and the world in which he lives.

"In our view the invigorating thrust of liberty and democracy should thrive in a climate of international security, but also one of social justice and economic and technological development.

(Mr. García Moritán, Argentina)

"These are among the reasons that lead me to stress how important it is for the negotiations under way in this as well as in other forums not to impinge on the right of all States to access to technology. A free world is strengthened by generous co-operation in resources and knowledge rather than by limitations and restrictions, which, under the pretext of legitimate interests, perpetuate the division of our world into North and South.

"The international community we all strive for must be underpinned by greater trust, respect and mutual understanding. It is time we all contributed to attaining that goal."

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Argentina for his statement, for his kind words addressed to the Chair and for transmitting the important message addressed to the Conference by His Excellency the President of Argentina. The distinguished representative of China, Ambassador Hou Zhitong, has asked for the floor.

Mr. HOU (China) (translated from Chinese): I feel greatly honoured to speak for the first time as head of the Chinese delegation in the plenary of the Conference on Disarmament. I would like to begin by warmly congratulating you, as the eminent representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on taking up the Chair for the first month of the 1990 session of the Conference. The Conference has already got off to a smooth start under your skilful guidance, which, I am convinced, will surely lay a good foundation for our work ahead. I wish to assure you that in the performance of your important duties as President you can count on active support and full co-operation from my delegation. I would also like to thank Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, who guided our work skilfully and effectively in August last year and during the inter-sessional period.

At the last plenary meeting on 6 February I listened attentively to the message sent to the Conference by Mr. Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, which reflected his personal attention and support and that of the United Nations to the Conference. The presence of Mr. Yasushi Akashi, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, at our Conference bears further testimony to such support. We are appreciative of this. We also had the great privilege of seeing His Excellency Mr. Hans van den Brock, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, and His Excellency Mr. Alois Mock, Vice-Chancellor and Foreign Minister of Austria, attending and addressing the Conference. The facts have shown that Governments and, indeed, the whole international community are lending ever-greater support and attaching great importance to the unique and important role of the Conference as the only multilateral disarmament negotiating forum of a global nature. I also wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Ambassador Komatina, Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and Ambassador Berasategui, Deputy Secretary-General, and to express my appreciation for the most effective work and the important contribution to the Conference made by them and by the secretariat under their leadership. I would like to ask them to convey the condolences of my delegation on the untimely death of Ms. Annie Rebuzzi.

(Mr. Hou, China)

Mr. President, my delegation warmly welcomes you and the other new colleagues, namely Ambassador Roberto García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, Ambassador José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar of the United States and Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela. Meanwhile, as China's new Ambassador for Disarmament Affairs, I wish to take this opportunity to express my regards to the distinguished representatives present here. I look forward to co-operating closely with you, my outstanding colleagues, and benefiting from your rich knowledge and experience. The Chinese delegation, together with other delegations, would like to bid farewell and express its best wishes to Ambassador de Montigny Marchand of Canada, Ambassador Vratislav Vajnar of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Alfonso García Robles of Mexico, Ambassador Max L. Friedersdorf of the United States and Ambassador Adolfo Raúl Taylhardat of Venezuela.

The distinguished representative of Mexico, Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch, in his capacity as the co-ordinator of the Group of 21, made a statement on behalf of the Group on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in the plenary on 6 February. My delegation concurs with and supports the statement. It is our consistent position that the future convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons should expressly stipulate a ban on the use of such weapons. This also represents the universal demand of the international community. The Final Declaration of the Paris Conference and the relevant resolutions of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly all emphasize this point. We therefore share the view that the mandate to be adopted for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons should indeed be improved, and that it is appropriate to include a reference on the prohibition of use. We are ready to continue to carry out constructive consultations with you, Mr. President, and with other delegations, in a spirit of active co-operation, so as to bring about an early start to substantive work in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of China for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. That concludes my list of speakers today. Does any other member wish to take the floor?

As announced at the opening of this plenary meeting, I shall now suspend it and in five minutes' time, convene an informal meeting of the Conference.

The plenary meeting was suspended at 10.55 a.m. and resumed at 11.05 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 533rd plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

As no decisions have emerged from the informal meeting just held by the Conference, I propose that we now adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 13 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.07 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.534
13 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 13 February 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

GE.90-60149/1566B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 534th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament. The President apologizes for being late, but he was involved in ongoing consultations.

In conformity with its programme of work, the Conference will continue to listen to plenary statements, as well as to deal with a number of organizational questions. In accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

At the end of the list of speakers, I shall suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting of the Conference for the consideration of requests for participation from States not members of the Conference. We will later resume this plenary meeting to continue our consideration of that subject.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representative of France, Ambassador Morel, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, to introduce the report of that Committee, as well as the representative of Romania. I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Morel of France, who will introduce the report of the Ad hoc Committee, which has been circulated today as document CD/961.

Mr. MOREL (France) (translated from French): Before introducing the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons on the results of its work during the inter-sessional period, allow me, Mr. President, to congratulate you on behalf of my country on your taking up the post of President of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of February. The extensive consultations you have already conducted to ensure a smooth start to our work, and the reaffirmation here in this room at the opening of the session by your Foreign Minister Mr. van den Broek of the commitment of the Netherlands to disarmament, show that we are not resuming our work in a spirit of routine, and on behalf of my country I should like to thank you for it. At the same time I thank Ambassador El Ghali Benhima of Morocco for so effectively presiding over the Conference during a very active month of August.

I should also like to mark the arrival of several colleagues in our midst: Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Roberto García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar of the United States of America, Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela and Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico. I should like to welcome them to this forum and assure them that my delegation will co-operate with them very actively. Changes entail goodbyes and very friendly wishes to their predecessors who have recently left Geneva: Ambassador Taylhardat, Ambassador Marchand, Ambassador Friedersdorf and Ambassador García Robles. How can we fail to reiterate on this occasion what we owe to Don Alfonso, who has contributed so much to shaping the personality of the Conference on Disarmament and who, for over 10 years, has shown us here in Geneva how disarmament could be both a passionate commitment and a dimension of

(Mr. Morel, France)

contemporary humanism? Lastly, allow me to share with the secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament, on behalf of the French delegation and on my own behalf, the profound sadness we felt on learning of the brutal death of Miss Annie Rebuzzi, whose effective and radiant presence on the sixth floor of the Palais contributed - without our always being fully aware of the fact - to the smooth running of our work.

As agreed at the last meeting of the summer part of the Conference's session, the Ad hoc Committee held open-ended consultations from 28 November to 14 December 1989, followed by a session of limited duration during the period from 11 January to 1 February 1990. This work led to a new version of the "rolling text" (CD/961), which I have the honour to introduce today. Before putting forward a few ideas at the end of a year as Chairman, I should like to comment point by point on the results of this inter-sessional period, which has been very useful in that, in keeping with established practice, it has enabled us largely to put the finishing touches to work already begun during the session itself. Six documents which are new or have been redrafted since the previous report have thus been drawn up.

First of all, the Protocol on inspection procedures. The agreement on a new text - which from now on, in the new version of the "rolling text", replaces the former "Guidelines on the international inspectorate" - rounds off several years of intensive work under the competent guidance of successive group chairmen, and this year particularly the Chairman of Group 1, Mr. Rüdiger Lüdeking, with very active support from many delegations. This commitment was legitimate given what was at stake, namely the development of one of the fundamental tools of the draft convention - verification. I think I can say without exaggeration that, imperfect and incomplete though it may be, this new text represents one of the important achievements of the 1989 session. We now have an outline of a code regulating the practical arrangements for inspections, the precise conduct of inspectors in terms of their rights and duties, and the obligations of States. The structure adopted enables us to draw a precise distinction between general provisions in the area of inspection procedures and specific aspects within the context of various types of inspection. Where the former are concerned, the new text contributes invaluable elements in the area of definitions and, more generally, a more structured presentation in terms of the successive stages of the inspection. As regards routine inspections, important clarifications have been added on the use of continuous monitoring systems.

The work on challenge inspections has enabled us to develop the concept of managed access, particularly in respect of the requirements of confidentiality, and to outline the role of the observer of the requesting State. Finally, a few basic elements, which should be of use for further study of the question, have been incorporated into the procedures governing cases of the alleged use of chemical weapons.

Secondly, the final clauses have been completed, with article XIV, on duration and withdrawal, article XVIII, on the deposit of instruments of ratification and accession, and article XX, on languages and authentic texts, which thus round off the overall structure of the convention as it appears in appendix I of the report. In this way, thanks to the Chairman of Group 2,

(Mr. Morel, France)

Mr. Mohammed Gomaa, the Committee has brought to a successful conclusion the complex work that had begun on the basis of the results of consultations conducted during the 1988 session by the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Sujka - results which existed in various versions and which did not commit delegations. It now remains for us to resume work on those matters that still appear in appendix II, namely, article XII, on international agreements, whose presentation has been improved, article XIII, on amendments, which was drawn up during the session, and various questions which have so far not been drawn up in the form of articles, namely, the settlement of disputes, reservations, the status of annexes and, above all, sanctions.

Thirdly, regarding the scientific advisory board, intensive work on the part of the Chairman of Group 3, Mr. Rakesh Sood, has enabled us, while remaining mindful of the legitimate concerns of various delegations, to define in article VIII the general architecture of this forum, which had already been outlined during the session. It seems to me - and the course of the negotiations can only confirm this - that we all acknowledge the need to draw in an appropriate way on the competence of representatives of the international scientific community, in order to adapt the future convention in the light of the development of science and technology, which are changing at an ever greater rate. But we are also concerned to avoid the risks of interference between this new subsidiary body and the operation of the tripartite institutional order established under the convention. This dictated a cautious approach, which led to the balanced arrangement described in the draft convention: an advisory role for the scientific board, which does not detract from its importance; linkage between the board and the Conference of States Parties, on the clear understanding that it will act in close symbiosis with the Director-General. The clarification of these basic concepts, which has now been achieved, should enable us in future to make progress on the work which remains to be done in due course, on the board's mandate, its organization and its operation in practice.

Fourthly, thanks to a generous spirit of conciliation on the part of delegations, the Chairman of Group 4, Mr. Johan Molander, was able, in the first place, to complete successfully a substantial revision of annex 1 to article VI, which in its new version, practically free of square brackets, reflects the agreement among all delegations on the specific conditions governing the limited production of prohibited chemicals on this schedule. The régime applicable to schedule 1 chemicals has thus been very markedly clarified. This refinement has, first of all, enabled us to define the framework for authorized manufacture properly, with the possibility of synthesis for protection purposes in a laboratory other than a small-scale facility. It was also accepted that it was not desirable to seek to control laboratories synthesizing less than 100 grams of such chemicals per year, which considerably facilitates verification and enables us to preserve the confidentiality needed by laboratories engaged in research for medical or pharmaceutical purposes.

Group 4 was also able to devote its last few meetings in January to arrangements for revising the schedules of chemicals and guidelines for the schedules. Its point of departure was suggestions presented during the summer part of the session and an initial paper on general problems proposed in

(Mr. Morel, France)

December. The debate was particularly interesting as it bore on an essential and so far barely studied point - the smooth running of the technical apparatus of the convention after its entry into force. The debates dealt essentially with decision-making arrangements, and led to a new text inserted in the annex on chemicals.

For the schedules this document suggests an evaluation of the Executive Council's proposal for a revision, along with a recommendation to States Parties; their agreement could be secured either tacitly or after formal acceptance by a yet-to-be-defined majority of States. In the absence of such approval, the proposal could be submitted to the Conference of States Parties, either at a regular or at a special session. As far as the guidelines are concerned, the machinery adopted, which is more restrictive, provides for an initial assessment by the Executive Council, followed by a recommendation to States Parties; the decision should in any event be taken by the Conference of States Parties.

Fifthly, in reviewing the work of the groups during the inter-sessional period, I must now recall that it was agreed last August to deal in Group 5 with the very important question of security during the destruction period. Consultations begun by the Group's Chairman, Dr. Walter Krutzsch, when the inter-sessional meetings resumed indicated that in the absence of the paper which was expected from the two countries which have declared that they possess chemical weapons, the conditions for useful work on the subject had not yet been met. But I should also note that developments in the past few months, and particularly the past few days, have confirmed that this necessary preliminary of bilateral work, which is eagerly awaited by the Committee, is well under way. It will then be for the Committee to resume this year, on a new basis, the in-depth consideration of this question, which is of interest to all delegations. I also wish to note that, towards the end of the inter-sessional period, some brackets and major footnotes to articles IV (Chemical weapons) and V (Chemical weapons production facilities) were deleted, which will facilitate the resumption of the Committee's work on this subject.

Sixthly, on challenge inspection, work continued up to the last few days of the inter-sessional period to finalize, in what was deemed the most appropriate manner, the document which had been under preparation throughout the year on this question, in order to define the essential elements which should appear in the second part of article IX of the draft convention. Regarding paragraph 5 of this text, it was considered a little early to clarify the concepts of alternative measures and managed access. On paragraph 6, in contrast, the discussion taken up again on the basis of language outlined in December enabled us, following very interesting and friuitful exchanges of view, to define two aspects of the final phase of consideration of the report after the completion of the inspection proper - namely, the provision of information to the parties and the Executive Council, and the role that can devolve upon the latter. It was not, however, possible to settle everything at a stroke, and at the end of our work, if I may put it like that, I had occasion to stress that we had not yet taken a decision on the decision-making process. But I feel that the new sequence outlined in paragraph 6, like the text as a whole, offers a sound framework for subsequent

(Mr. Morel, France)

reflection, and may be the beginning of a compromise between the various points of view as to the role that should devolve upon the requesting State, the requested State and the organs of the convention.

As for its placement, it was finally agreed that appendix II should continue to be the home of this text, which stems from consultations with all delegations, and which now replaces the former text that was drawn up in 1987 by the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Ekéus, and added to in 1988 - a text which on his sole responsibility represented a first representation of the various points of view. An introductory section preceding the new document, as well as the various footnotes, clearly show that this is a step forward to be followed up in the context of ongoing work, namely, the elaboration of article IX, part 2. Bearing in mind the importance of this procedure, which all delegations consider to be the corner-stone of the system of verification under the future convention, I venture to stress that this is an urgent task.

Seventh and last, I would like to mention that during the inter-sessional period the Committee benefited from the very intensive work of the Technical Group on Instrumentation created last June and chaired by Dr. Marjatta Rautio. As this work is not a direct part of the negotiations, it was deemed preferable not to insert the Group's final report, which was distributed on 22 January as document CD/CW/WP.272. However, its principal elements are mentioned in paragraph 7 of the introductory part of the "rolling text", and I should like to take this opportunity to stress that this first methodical inventory of the technical and scientific facilities and procedures necessary for the proper implementation of the convention has been very enlightening for all delegations. This report offers a first overall picture and outlines avenues of research for the experts. The work of the Group also made it possible to identify various technical adjustments necessary to arrive at more coherent procedures. More generally, it enabled us to measure to what extent the Committee increasingly required the support of experts to prepare, as of now, for the smooth practical implementation of the future convention.

Allow me to conclude this year as Chairman of the Committee by presenting a few more personal comments. Let me say first of all that it was a fascinating experience, conducted in the course of a year which in many ways was exceptional, in many areas, of course, but also where chemical weapons are concerned, with a remarkable series of decisive initiatives which I need not recall here. Though less spectacular, the speeding up of negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament has been an integral part of this unprecedented sequence, which highlighted the growing importance accorded by the international community to disarmament in the field of chemical weapons. We may regret that in the course of the session it was not possible to complete the task assigned to us, but we must properly weigh up what finalization means. The disappointed expectations of a decisive breakthrough which would resolve the "outstanding problems" at a stroke does not entirely correspond to what remains to be done. At the risk of stretching this strategic metaphor, I will observe that the entire front has moved and that we will succeed in concluding the convention by dealing with it as an integrated and coherent whole.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Specifically I believe that after a year of intensive work on all aspects of the convention we can and must begin to regard the convention as a whole which has already begun to settle into coherence and balance. By the same token, that which remains to be done can in a way be identified in terms of the edifice already built. By proceeding thus by deduction we will be better able to single out the most important areas on which real decisions have to be taken.

Does this mean that the completion of the negotiations now depends only on a few political decisions? I am not convinced of that. At the risk of repeating myself, the experience of the session now coming to an end leads me to observe that politics and technical matters cannot be completely dissociated. Certainly we should avoid getting bogged down in perfectionism or secondary considerations, but we should also beware of believing that we can find a sort of "leg-up" to overcome real difficulties. Yet the approach we have developed little by little together in the course of this year offers two interesting and complementary directions for the last phase of our work. It is a fact that the major questions can be truly settled only if we embark on in-depth work, where the precision of what is known as technical work necessarily has a place. But it is equally true that a number of other technical issues related to the smooth application of the convention can, with the agreement of all delegations, be detached from the negotiations proper and settled in parallel, without being deferred until later.

In the course of this session, we have also better appreciated to what extent the convention had to be universal and hence benefit from accession by all States, to begin with by enabling all States wishing to contribute to negotiations to do so. This broadening of the negotiating work has been the result of more active involvement of delegations of member States and at the same time a broader, more resolute contribution on the part of delegations of non-member States. New work habits have appeared, but we can surely move even further in this direction.

This is also the moment to mention the role of those I would call the "new interlocutors" of delegations, who, without directly participating in the negotiations, contribute essential elements - whether these be - first and foremost, of course - experts from industry, with whom an informal but permanent dialogue has now been established, and whose remarkable commitment in the trial inspections already prefigures the operation of the convention, scientific circles, whose vital contribution is better recognized today, the press, non-governmental organizations, and parliamentarians, who will be both our judges and our counterparts in each national legal system. This brief enumeration of so many partners whose role will constantly grow in this final phase of our work leads me to stress to what extent the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, while pursuing its unstinting daily task, should now size up its collective responsibility in respect of the convention. The more the convention appears as a whole which is in the process of being finalized - and it is more complete than it seems at first glance - the more we must be ready to commit ourselves together to bring it to the stage of full implementation. All delegations agree that about a year will be needed to complete the process - if, of course, the momentum is maintained. Since the calendar is no longer at issue, it remains for us to take the measure of all that this

(Mr. Morel, France)

entails, for us here in Geneva, and for our Governments, and to do so in a very political sense, not to say a moral sense. It is time to say, with Blaise Pascal, "Nous sommes engagés" - we are firmly committed to a difficult task.

It remains for me to thank all the delegations for their stimulating contributions throughout this session, their striking readiness to co-operate, and their encouragement, which has been of great assistance to me. More particularly I should like to thank the delegations in the extended bureau, especially those of the co-ordinators, the United Kingdom, Sweden and Poland, who were my daily partners. My gratitude goes to the five Group Chairmen, Rüdiger Lüdeking, Mohammed Gomaa, Rakesh Sood, Johan Molander and Walter Krutzsch, who have become true companions and friends, as well as Dr. Rautio. I also publicly thank the secretariat of the Ad hoc Committee, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, Secretary of the Committee, Ms. Agnès Marcaillou, Mr. Michael Cassandra and Ms. Cheryl Darby, thanks to whom the convention takes shape each day, and I also pay tribute to their exemplary devotion. This is also true of the interpreters, the translators and the conference officers. Lastly, may I be permitted to express my gratitude to the French delegation as a whole - Olivier de la Baume, Pierre Canonne, Michel Pouchepadas, Marie-Thérèse Desbois and Malika Cheniti? All that we have done here in the Palais and the Villa des Ormeaux, we have done together in a true team spirit, without which nothing is possible.

The time has come to extend my warm wishes for success to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee for this session, Ambassador Hyltenius. These wishes may be expressed in a few words which speak for themselves: continuity, experience, competence, rigour, ambition. The fate of our convention is in good hands.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for introducing the report of the Ad hoc Committee, as well as for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I wish to express to Ambassador Morel our deep appreciation for the outstanding manner in which he has discharged his responsibilities as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, "une expérience passionnante" in his own words. His diplomatic skill, experience and dedication have considerably advanced the work of that subsidiary body, and I wish also to extend our congratulations to him for the progress achieved since he was appointed Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee.

As you know, the Conference has to adopt this report, and I should like to suggest that we proceed to do so at our plenary meeting on Tuesday, 20 February, in accordance with the practice followed by the Conference when dealing with reports of subsidiary bodies.

I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Mr. Chirila.

Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) (translated from French): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to say how much the Romanian delegation welcomes the fact that you are presiding over the Conference on Disarmament in this important month for the beginning of the work of this year's session. Our satisfaction is the greater because you represent the Netherlands, a State

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

with which Romania has long-standing relations, and we hope now to strengthen and broaden these relations further. We are convinced that you will guide our efforts with wisdom and competence. We would also like to congratulate Ambassador Benhima of Morocco for the skill and determination with which he led the work of the Conference during August 1989 and the inter-sessional period. We warmly welcome the distinguished representatives who have recently taken up the posts of head of delegation of their countries: Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Shannon of Canada, Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States and Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico. We would like to welcome them and assure them of our full co-operation. Allow me to join my delegation's voice to those who have already expressed condolences on the death of Miss Annie Rebuzzi, a member of the Conference secretariat.

The Conference on Disarmament is beginning its work this year in a context in which the opportunities and prospects are particularly favourable. One element which seems increasingly to rally both the hopes and the efforts of the international community is based mainly on the view that the general political climate favours the reduction of military confrontation and the strengthening of peace and stability.

In his message to the Conference the Secretary-General of the United Nations, echoing the views of many political leaders, mentioned among the factors converging in this direction facts and trends such as the East-West rapprochement, the evolution towards settlement of conflicts in various parts of the world, the important political changes in Europe and in other regions of the world, and the involvement of the United Nations in the major problems that face the international community today.

Analysts say that 1989 was perhaps the most important year in contemporary history. As for my country, we say that 1989 has been a sacramental year for Romania. Obviously this is without ignoring or minimizing in any way the changes in general in Europe and in the world. As you are aware, following the victory of the revolution and the elimination of the dictatorship on 22 December 1989, Romania has set out on a totally new path. From the outset the guiding principle of any programme of action of the Romanian Government was laid down to be the promotion of a domestic and foreign policy in line with the needs and interests of human beings, and full respect for human rights and for Romania's international commitments. Obviously things will not necessarily be easy for us, but the evolution towards authentic democracy in all its dimensions, the natural opening up towards Europe and the world, are irreversible. It goes without saying that a commitment or an effective contribution to the efforts to implement the agreements, as well as the implementation of measures in the field of disarmament, are an integral part of this orientation, this policy on the part of Romania. Always irreversible, ever more effective, we wish to see the large spectrum of negotiations of a universal, regional and bilateral nature as a process that will make disarmament an ever more rapid and perceptible phenomenon in terms of agreements and concrete measures.

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

In the light of the dynamic progress in international life, the Geneva Conference, the sole framework for comprehensive negotiations for disarmament, must make a more significant contribution, both through negotiation of agreements and measures and through the encouragement of all the discussions and negotiations at all levels and in all areas of disarmament. One of the areas in which the Conference on Disarmament is called upon and in a position to make an immediate and decisive contribution is the negotiation of a convention on the prohibition of the use, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. Our position concerning chemical disarmament, which is fully marked by openness, a positive approach and determination, is in fact based on two equally important elements: first, my country's position of principle in favour of the banning and elimination of all weapons of mass destruction as soon as possible; second, the fact that Romania possesses no chemical weapons.

We would like to stress here, with all the vigour and determination deriving from the mandate entrusted to our delegation, that Romania has no intention of producing or acquiring chemical weapons in the future. We have firm and clear instructions to act with determination to ensure that the ongoing negotiations are intensified and lead as soon as possible to the conclusion of a universal convention to ban chemical weapons, on the basis of the "rolling text" of the draft. To that end we intend to participate actively in and contribute to the best of our ability to the finalization of the draft articles that are still under discussion. We are of course aware of the problems and difficulties, notable among them that of monitoring, guaranteeing the full implementation of the future regulations. We are in favour of a system of strict and effective monitoring, including facilities for manufacturing chemicals which could present a risk of any kind for the convention. At the same time, we share the practically universal concern to ensure that the future convention does not affect the development of the chemical industry or legitimate international co-operation for peaceful purposes. At the same time we welcome and are ready to support any initiative, gesture or act that will bring us closer as soon as possible to the objective that is imperative by virtue of the weight of the evidence, considerations of effectiveness and from all points of view, namely, the conclusion of a convention universally banning and totally eliminating chemical weapons for ever. In this context, we have learned of the official confirmation that the Soviet Union and the United States plan at the Soviet-American summit next June to conclude a bilateral agreement on the destruction of a part of their CW stockpiles until equal lower levels are reached. We hope that, far from shifting the centre of interest, the Soviet-American bilateral agreement, like any other action in the same field, will encourage and contribute to our negotiations here in Geneva in the multilateral context.

Ambassador Pierre Morel of France, who so assiduously and skilfully guided the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during the preceding session, has just given us an overall picture of the efforts made and the results obtained. However, we cannot hide a certain feeling that, particularly where decisive - political - questions are concerned, the results could have been more significant, especially in view of the more favourable general conditions in recent times. The declaration introduced on behalf

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

of the Group of 21 at the first plenary meeting of the session by Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico should of course be placed in this context. Our delegation is ready to support the proposals made by the Group of 21 in the 6 February declaration. At the same time, we have also seen the significance of reference made by Ambassador Morel in his personal remarks and in his statement to the risk of the illusion of a "leg-up". We will offer our full co-operation to this year's Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, and we will do our best to make our modest contribution to collective action on the important and urgent problem of the conclusion of a universal convention on prohibition. We feel that in order to achieve these objectives we have to act with determination and without any prejudice or pre-conditions. In general we consider that, in the field of disarmament, the only approach is to act with perseverance and realism and to move forward gradually towards the achievement of agreements and measures without conditions or artificial linkages.

The negotiation and conclusion of a universal treaty for the cessation and complete prohibition of nuclear tests remains a priority objective on the international disarmament agenda and the agenda of our Conference. Even if it was not possible to set up an ad hoc committee to consider this subject last session, we hope that such a forum for work and negotiations can be set up this year. We welcome and support any efforts to that end, and we have taken note of the willingness of Ambassador Donowaki of Japan to continue the efforts of his predecessor, Ambassador Yamada, on this subject. At the same time we consider that any action to achieve this objective by stages should also be welcomed and placed in the general context of the need to achieve a comprehensive and final solution. We fully appreciate the work of the Group of Seismic Experts to define and install a model international data exchange system for the detection of seismic events, for use in identifying nuclear tests. We will not fail to do our best to support this activity, inter alia through direct involvement and participation.

The Geneva Conference must also continue to concern itself and to seek the most promising ways to consider and negotiate questions designed to halt the nuclear arms race and achieve disarmament in this field. We cannot but fully share the view that so-called "nuclear deterrence" is in fact likely to perpetuate the nuclear arms race. We are for, and we support, agreements to reduce nuclear weapons until they are totally eliminated. Such agreements should be negotiated both between the nuclear-weapon States and, in a broader context, with participation by all, on problems of concern to all. In the first category falls the conclusion of an agreement on 50 per cent reductions in the strategic weapons held by the United States and the Soviet Union, and the beginning of negotiations to eliminate tactical nuclear missiles in Europe. Also in the nuclear context, our Conference should not lose sight of, and should find ways to achieve effective progress in, efforts to provide security guarantees to the non-nuclear-weapon States so that they are not attacked by or threatened with nuclear weapons. We welcome the almost immediate re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee to consider this problem. In carrying out its work the Conference on Disarmament should also bear constantly in mind the prospects and questions which arise from the fact that this very year Geneva will once again host the conference entrusted with the task of reviewing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, as

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

well as the fact that the international agenda also includes the convening of a conference to consider the proposal to amend the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty by extending it to cover underground zones.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space, as the recent General Assembly resolutions prove, remains one of the major concerns of the international community. We support all measures negotiated and agreed bilaterally or multilaterally, even if they are incomplete, which can prevent the introduction of weapons and weapons systems in outer space. We favour respect for and the broadening of all existing rules in this field. Our delegation is ready to give its support to proposals concerning, inter alia, the banning of anti-satellite weapons, the elaboration of a code of conduct in outer space or the monitoring of objects launched into space. In our view the mandate and activities of the Ad hoc Committee on outer space at this year's session should reflect and mark a more targeted orientation towards an approach which is both realistic and specific.

Our Conference will be unable to do its best in discharging its mandate unless due attention is given to preventing the development and introduction of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We consider, indeed, that it is high time to study, with all requisite concern and seriousness, the question of an international draft convention on this subject. Our delegation is of course ready to give its full support to efforts to ban radiological weapons, including the banning of attacks against peaceful nuclear installations.

Lastly, allow me to make a few brief references to the organization of the work of the Conference. Our delegation has a clear mandate to act, together with the other members of the Conference, for a gradual move to concrete negotiations concerning all the questions entrusted to it by the General Assembly, as well as the setting up of appropriate working structures to that end. Greater stress on concrete and realistic aspects, on working contacts, consultations and negotiations concerning specific subjects is necessary. If the Conference is to discharge its mission it must reflect as far as possible the international community as a whole. In this context, we are in favour of any initiative to enlarge the Conference and, in general, to meet the desires and the readiness of the largest possible number of States to participate, to be actively involved in the work of the Conference, its working bodies and negotiating bodies. We hope that this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament and its work will be commensurate with the positive changes and developments in international life as a whole that have been generally welcomed.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Romania for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to me. That exhausts my list of speakers. I recognize the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): Although I have not spoken before in this forum, and although I intend to make a more formal initial statement to the Conference in the very near future, I would like to take the floor now to make a couple of brief remarks.

First, I wish to inform members of the Conference on Disarmament that the United States delegation is pleased to have with us today United States

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Congressman Martin Lancaster and members of his staff. Mr. Lancaster is visiting the United States delegation in his capacity as one of four members of the United States House of Representatives who have been appointed by the Speaker of the House, Mr. Foley as special arms control observers for the chemical weapons negotiations. Congressman Lancaster is making his second trip to Geneva in this capacity, and we welcome his presence among us today as clear evidence that United States interest in a CW convention extends well beyond the executive branch. The United States Congress follows our work here with keen interest. We look forward to working closely with Mr. Lancaster and his colleagues on Capitol Hill.

Secondly, I would like to draw the attention of the members of the Conference to the joint statement on chemical weapons which was issued in Moscow on 10 February, three days ago, by Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Together with my Soviet colleague, Minister Batsanov, I participated in the Ministerial Meeting and in the preparation of this important bilateral statement. In the United States view, this statement reaffirms President Bush's strong commitment to progress in the multilateral negotiations for a CW convention and our expectation that those bilateral efforts will enhance our multilateral work. You will see that the statement, first of all, reiterates our joint commitment to conclude and bring into force a CW convention as soon as possible. Secondly, it announces our intention, simultaneous with the negotiations on a global ban, to pursue reciprocal obligations: inter alia a programme of co-operation with respect to the destruction of chemical weapons, including co-ordinating the destruction of substantial quantities of CW stocks down to equal low levels on each side. Third, as part of this agreement, we will co-operate on safe destruction technology and carry out further verification experiments. Fourth, we commit ourselves further to reduce our CW stocks down to a very small fraction of present holdings during the first eight years after a CW convention enters into force, and to complete elimination during the subsequent two years, if possible. Fifth, we agree to halt all CW production when a CW convention enters into force. And, finally, the two sides will work to develop common principles that underlie our efforts to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons.

President Bush believes that as the countries with the largest CW stocks, the United States and the Soviet Union should take the lead in destruction. This will give impetus to the negotiations, in our view, by demonstrating how serious the United States and the Soviet Union are about getting rid of these weapons. Our proposal to destroy all but a very small portion of CW stocks in the first eight years of a convention, we believe, puts this convention on a faster track than the ideas some of our countries talked about before, which would have delayed entry into force until all essential States adhere. What we are saying now is - let us get the convention into force right away with the United States and the Soviet Union on board so that the benefits can be realized right away, and we can work hard to get the other necessary States on board. If we succeed over the first 8 years we can all go to zero in 10 years; if not, it is the United States interpretation that we will have to keep at it. At least we will have the convention with its reductions, production ban, export controls, secretariat, etc.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

In addition to passing out this statement to you today, my Soviet colleague and I will shortly be circulating this paper as a formal CD document through the auspices of the secretariat.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Ledogar, for his statement. I am happy to note and welcome the presence of Congressman Lancaster at this meeting. I am sure that we will benefit from his visit to this body, and that it will assist us in our negotiations. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not.

I shall now suspend the plenary meeting and, as announced today, convene an informal meeting of the Conference in a few minutes' time to consider requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Conference.

The meeting was suspended at 11.10 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 534th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

As a result of the informal meeting that we have just held, I propose that we take a decision, as indicated in the note by the President which the secretariat has circulated today as document CD/WP.379, concerning 30 requests from non-member States to participate in our work. Since no objections were raised at the informal meeting, I suggest that we now adopt this decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: In connection with the decision just taken, I wish to state the following:

As is well known, the Conference on Disarmament is a specialist body. It is the unique global multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. There is a tradition among CD members of concentrating in their discussions very much on the disarmament issues at hand. This has been the general practice as well for the non-members invited to participate. Many non-members have made contributions of outstanding practical value to our disarmament work. I trust - and am confident - that those non-members who we have just invited will make a constructive contribution to the negotiations and, as the case might be, pre-negotiations on the disarmament issues they have chosen. It is understood that, in accordance with the rules of procedure and the practice of the Conference, invitations extended to non-members are for the 1990 session. It goes without saying that any action from which our negotiations would not benefit would be most inappropriate. In fact, the participation of States non-members of the Conference should contribute to the universality of disarmament agreements.

Our negotiations on a convention banning chemical weapons have shown encouraging progress. This is all the more timely since we have witnessed in the recent past how much suffering chemical weapons may cause. May I therefore remind all delegations, those of member States as well as those of States wishing to accede to the status of participating non-members, that all States participating in the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical

(The President)

weapons made the following call in its Final Declaration: "In addition, in order to achieve as soon as possible the indispensable universal character of the convention, they call upon all States to become parties thereto as soon as it is concluded." In this context I note that all 30 States non-members that have addressed communications to us have indicated their wish to participate in our negotiations on chemical weapons.

I have no other business for today, but I recognize the following speakers. There are requests for the floor from Canada, the USSR, Australia and the Islamic Republic of Iran. I recognize the distinguished Ambassador of Canada.

Mr. SHANNON (Canada): This is the first occasion also for me to speak at the Conference on Disarmament. Even though my intervention is to be only a very brief one, focusing on the subject we are now addressing, which is the participation of non-member States that have asked to join in our work, nevertheless I would like to begin on a personal note by thanking you, Sir, and all those others present who have so kindly welcomed me as newcomer to your midst. I am very pleased to take my place here and I can assure you that as was the case of my predecessor Canada will continue to play an active, positive and constructive role in the work of the Conference. Certainly that is my own objective. I also wish to congratulate you on the assumption of the presidency of the Conference, and we are fortunate indeed to have as a President a man of such experience in disarmament and possessing such obvious diplomatic skills.

As we all know, a considerable number of non-member States wrote to you or to the Secretary-General, asking to participate in one or more of our activities. We in Canada are very much encouraged by the increasing level of interest in the work of the Conference that other United Nations Member States are showing. We firmly believe that such an enlarged contribution to our work can only be beneficial. It can bring new ideas and insights into the conduct of our negotiations. And it can sensitize more countries to the complexity of the issues with which we are dealing. Canada has always been an active supporter in the overall United Nations context of the concept of universality of participation, at least as much as possible in the particular contexts of the various institutions involved. More specifically, at the Conference on Disarmament, we strongly support the concept that every United Nations Member State that wishes to do so should be able to join in our work. We are therefore extremely pleased that the final step towards reaching a consensus on this matter which you have so energetically and skilfully been pursuing during the past weeks has finally been taken and that we can now welcome some 30 additional States to share in our work.

But Canada also strongly believes that the privilege of participating carries with it an equal obligation to do so in a positive and helpful manner. The Conference is very much a gathering in which individual States and groupings of States may well have legitimate differences about how best to achieve our goals. And it is only right and proper that those differences be clearly stated and supported. But this is not a political forum, such as is the General Assembly of the United Nations. Here our basic objectives of reaching agreement on instruments that can lead to a safer and more peaceful

(Mr. Shannon, Canada)

world are shared among all of us. It is therefore, in our view, not at all appropriate for States to indulge in polemics and especially to attack one another in this forum. Canada has very much regretted such instances in the past and we very much hope that nothing of that sort will occur in the future.

Mr. BATSANOV: (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all, Mr. President, allow me to congratulate you on taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament and wish you every success. In fact, I think you have already proved that you can achieve progress on highly complex issues, and find solutions to extremely delicate situations. At the same time the Soviet delegation would like to reiterate its gratitude to your precedessor, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco, for the major contribution he made to the work of the Conference. As this is the first time I have taken the floor in the month of February, I should also like to welcome our new colleagues Ambassador Andrea Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki of Japan, Ambassador Roberto Garcia Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador José Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar of the United States, Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, Ambassador Horacio Arteaga of Venezuela and Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico. In the time that has elapsed we have seen the departures of Ambassador Vajnar, Ambassador Taylhardat, Ambassador Marchand, Ambassador Friedersdorf and Ambassador García Robles, who for a long time was our inspiration and our oldest member. We wish them prosperity, good health and success.

We should like to associate ourselves with delegates who spoke before me in expressing grief at the very tragic and dreadful death of Ms. Rebuzzi.

Although the session has just begun, we have already succeeded under your presidency, Sir, in solving a very important issue - the question of participation in the work of the Conference by non-member States. In the view of the Soviet delegation, your efforts and your contribution to the constructive solution of this issue deserve the highest appreciation. At the same time I should like to note that it proved possible to reach a positive solution to the issue of observers, as it is conventionally known, as a result of the flexibility and responsible approach displayed by a large number of members of the Conference. The Soviet delegation attaches due importance to this fact. I think that by adopting a positive decision on the requests submitted by non-member States of the Conference we are not simply helping to foster a favourable climate for the work of the Conference and the working bodies concerned - we are actually doing ourselves a service, because these are negotiations on disarmament, i.e. on the reduction and elimination of armaments which threaten all of us. To a considerable extent this relates to the problem of chemical weapons.

It is no accident that the Paris Conference stressed that all States wishing to contribute to the negotiations should be able to do so. The Soviet delegation has unswervingly supported and continues to support this appeal made by the Paris Conference, which is of fundamental significance in guaranteeing the universality of the future convention, and, to put it bluntly without beating about the bush, in order that none of us should ever become the victim of a chemical attack, that there should be no repetition of the

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

tragedies which have occurred in recent years. Hence the guaranteeing of the universal nature of the future convention is a goal in which all the members of the Conference on Disarmament, as well as all other States, should have a keen interest. This idea was also reflected in the recent Soviet-American statement on chemical weapons, adopted following talks in Moscow between the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Eduard Shevardnadze, and Secretary of State Baker of the United States. This statement has just been referred to by the distinguished Ambassador Ledogar of the United States, with whom (I hope he will forgive me) we expended a good deal of effort and nervous energy in Moscow to arrive in the end at what we consider a good statement.

Ambassador Ledogar has already described its content. Consequently, without repeating what has already been said I should like to note a few important points in this connection. The statement reaffirms the aim of finalizing the convention at the earliest date. The statement also stresses the desire of both parties, even as the multilateral negotiations proceed, to draw up a bilateral agreement on reciprocal obligations, including, inter alia, the destruction of a considerable part of the two countries' chemical weapons stockpiles. In this connection I should like to stress that in the view of the Soviet Union, such an agreement should contain provision for both the elimination and reduction of chemical weapons stockpiles (this is certainly correct) and the cessation of the production of chemical weapons. In the statement adopted as a result of the recent meeting of ministers stress is laid on the readiness of both sides to reduce their stockpiles of chemical weapons down to very low levels in the first eight years after the convention enters into force. Of course, all remaining stocks of chemical weapons will have to be eliminated, as the statement says, over the subsequent two years. Our position in this regard is unequivocal. We are in favour of the reaffirmation of the already agreed 10-year period for the elimination of all stockpiles of chemical weapons. Of course we agree that all States which are capable of possessing chemical weapons should accede to the convention.

Moreover, we consider that work to this end should begin now, without any delays. At the same time we are far from convinced that the completion of the process of elimination of chemical weapons in the course of the already established 10-year destruction period should be made dependent on accession to the convention by one particular State or another. We are experiencing serious concern in connection with the implications of such an approach, although, as I have already said, we subscribe to the aim of securing participation in the convention by all relevant countries. In the statement it is asserted - and we also deem this to be important - that a multilateral convention should contain a provision whereby all production of chemical weapons must cease from the moment of its entry into force.

In conclusion I should like to say the following. We sincerely welcome all those who, in keeping with the decision just adopted in the Conference, will join us in our work. We can see a continuation and a strengthening of the tendency towards an increase in the number of countries which manifest not theoretical but practical interest in our work. This applies not only to negotiations on chemical weapons, but also to a number of other bodies which either operate within the framework of the Conference on a permanent basis, or else are set up on an annual basis. In supporting the decision just adopted,

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

our fundamental premise is that all the countries involved will be participating in our work in the most constructive fashion, remembering that our common purpose is to move forward along the path of arms limitation and disarmament, and that this can be achieved only if you respect your negotiating partner and if you set yourself the goal of progress at disarmament negotiations. It is quite obvious that a different approach - the introduction of elements of confrontation - cannot either lead to success or earn respect. For my part, I should like to state that we will always be ready to lend the necessary support and co-operation to non-member States of the Conference which are going to participate in our joint work.

Mr. REESE (Australia): I take the floor today to speak about the participation this year of 30 non-member States in the Conference on Disarmament. I would hope to have a subsequent opportunity in the course of the Conference to speak about the broader interests Australia has in the area of arms control and disarmament.

Australia welcomes the interest shown by the 30 non-member States in applying to participate in the work of the Conference and in the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons in particular. Australia supports the principle of the universality of participation in the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, which was endorsed at the Paris Conference. We see that participation as contributing to universal adherence to the Convention. The constructive participation of non-members in the negotiations is, therefore, important. We welcome the substantive contribution which a number of non-members have already made to the Committee's work, and we look forward to that contribution continuing.

In the critical year ahead of us in the Committee we would hope that all participating non-members ensure that their contributions are of a positive character and will help us in our negotiations to conclude the chemical weapons convention.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): As I am taking the floor for the first time under your stewardship, Sir, I first wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency for the month of February. I am very happy from a professional and personal point of view to see you in the Chair presiding over our Conference. I also wish to express my gratitude to our previous President, Ambassador Benhima of Morocco. Let me also extend a warm welcome to those representatives which have arrived in the last month: Ambassador García Moritán of Argentina, Ambassador Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, yourself - Ambassador Wagenmakers of the Netherlands, Amnbassador Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ambassador Hou of China, Ambassador Arteaga of Venezuela, Ambassador Ledogar of the United States of America, Ambassador Shannon of Canada and Ambassador Bosch of Mexico. We pledge our co-operation to all of the new colleagues.

It is with regret that I note the departure of Ambassador Bullut of Kenya, Ambassador Yamada of Japan, Ambassador van Schaik of the Netherlands, Ambassador Lechuga Hevia of Cuba, Ambassador Fan of China,

(Mr. von Stulpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

Ambassador Taylhardat of Venezuela, Ambassador Friedersdorf of the United States of America, Ambassador de Montigny Marchand of Canada and Ambassador García Robles of Mexico, our dean for many, many years.

I would, at this juncture, where we have overcome potentially substantial problems for our negotiations, thank all those participating States and all those member States who have contributed in a responsible and positive way. I would also thank those who have particularly contributed to our negotiations, especially in chemical weapons, over time. I cited as a particular token of fidelity and engagement the delegation of Finland, which has contributed as much, if not more, than member delegations. I may utter the wish that all delegations having the right to participate, members and non-members, contribute more than their presence. What my delegation would regret would be participation not with a material object in view but the perceived behaviour of other States.

Also, the plenary should abide by rule 30 of our rules of procedure, which clearly says that it is the right of any member State of the Conference to raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

The CD, which I knew almost four years ago, had strong elements then of confrontation and verbal battles. In the last years, though, we have become more reasonable and more reasoned. We have concentrated more on our work at hand, we have put more impetus in the matters of multilateral disarmament. I hope that all participating States will accept this new and more fruitful style of our Conference. What my delegation hopes for is mainly useful and future-orientated work in the field of chemical weapons, our main course. All States carrying responsibility here - some more, some less - let us all live up to our respective responsibility.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. NASSERI (Islamic Republic of Iran): This is a brief intervention on the issue that we have just decided upon. Therefore, I will confine myself to congratulating you, Mr. President, on taking up the presidency in the hectic month of February. We have already witnessed your diplomatic skills in resolving otherwise difficult problems, and I do not need to elaborate further on that. I think you are already assured of the full co-operation of my delegation on matters related to the work of the Conference, even difficult matters.

May I also, just briefly, thank my dear colleague, the Ambassador of Morocco, for the able way he conducted the affairs of the Conference in the month of August and during the inter-sessional period, and extend a warm welcome to our new colleagues? There are a number of them; for the purpose of brevity, at this stage, I will avoid naming every single one of them to this Conference.

On the issue just decided, I wish to make the following statement, and in doing so, I hope that I can be pardoned for being a bit frank as the

(Mr. Nasseri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

sensitivity of the issue obliges me to be frank and straightforward. This important session of the Conference has commenced its work amidst great enthusiasm as we all anticipate great progress in various areas of disarmament, including above all in the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention. Many have contributed in the past to the gradual but solid development and evolvement of this very comprehensive convention. The tireless efforts of Ambassador Morel were particularly timely as they fully prepared the ground for this year's important deliberations under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Hyltenius and his knowledgeable colleagues.

There is, indeed, good reason for enthusiasm as developments are all encouraging. Collectively they have given rise to the valid perception that the convention is no longer a distant hope but something that is very much for real and very close at hand. It is also understandable that more countries should now wish to participate in the work of the Conference, which would indeed welcome this as another sign that the Conference is moving in the right direction and is able to produce results and achievements. Indeed, the Conference has benefited from the valuable contributions of a number of non-members who have participated in the past as active observers and who are invited with pleasure and gratitutde to continue their participation.

However, considering the very delicate nature of the work of the Conference on Disarmament, particularly on the CW convention, we feel that we should not have become overly anxious. We still believe that we probably have. While we understand the political reasoning behind the new proposal on participation, we are very much concerned about its possible negative implications. This clustered "all or none" proposal may have seemed an easy way out of a possible political confrontation, something that we did not wish to see repeated in this forum again, but whether it can help the work of the Conference and the chemical weapons convention in the future remains doubtful. We believe it was perhaps inappropriate and much less fair to, in a way, put participants with distinguished records of positive contributions on the same footing as countries with the most verified record of use of chemical weapons, but, aside from the question of fairness, we have to be cognizant of the implications for our work. A case-by-case approach was a well-established procedure which gave the members a chance to review and decide on every application based on its merits. Active and positive participation was thus recognized, valued and welcomed. This, in turn, encouraged other countries to participate with the same positive notions and commitment. The new proposal may very well put an end to that useful trend and may even reverse it. We hope this will not be the case, as there have already been a number of statements which stressed the need for participation by non-members with a positive attitude in mind.

I am not suggesting that a full commitment to the CW convention before its finalization should be a pre-condition or prerequisite for participation. There may be States which are still examining the issue. This is their prerogative. But how about those who are fully committed in their official positions and in their practice not to the objective of the convention but quite the contrary? Our reservations on the application by Israel stem from a position of principle shared by many States in and outside our region.

(Mr. Nasseri, Islamic Republic of Iran)

On the application of Iraq there were many reasons for objections. This is a State which still prides itself in official positions on having extensively used chemical weapons as a justified means of warfare, and is engaged in an aggressive chemical weapon production, development and stockpiling programme. Not a single sign thus far that they intend to reverse their decisions and policies regarding this matter - not a single sign.

We have been told that these States should be allowed in, so as to remove any possible excuse for a possible eventual refusal to join the convention. But is there any assurance in this? If we base our work on removing excuses for those who are only looking for excuses, we have probably entrapped ourselves in a never-ending process. Nonetheless, we have decided not to oppose their application for this year, after having received assurances from members and non-members alike that this is not an isolated move but a part of a collection of activities to ensure the universality of the convention and to help eradicate chemical weapons from the world and from our region. The sincere desire of many States which have approached us in the last weeks, along with the dedicated efforts of Ambassador Wagenmakers, have thus contributed to our decision.

I shall add as a personal note that this decision is also a gesture of goodwill to Iraq, which, through reciprocation, may lead to co-operation in other international issues, activities and organizations as well as contributing to peace and security in our region.

I can only reiterate at the end, as the President underlined, that this decision is limited to the current year. The matter stands to be reviewed and reassessed next year within the guidelines that the President set forward.

The PRESIDENT: I thank Ambassador Nasseri, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, for his statement and for the kind words that he addressed to the Chair. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not. I therefore now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 15 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.535
15 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 15 February 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

GE.90-60174/1576B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 535th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In conformity with its programme of work, the Conference will continue to listen to plenary statements, as well as to deal with a number of organizational questions. However, in accordance with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

I wish to inform the Conference that consultations on a mandate for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons are continuing. The wish has been conveyed to me that we might hold an informal meeting after the list of speakers is exhausted to take stock of the situation. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

I have on my list of speakers today the representatives of Peru and the Federal Republic of Germany. I now give the floor to the representative of Peru, Ambassador de Rivero.

Mr. de RIVERO (Peru) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I would like to convey to you my country's warmest congratulations on your taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament on behalf of the Netherlands. I wish you every success in the performance of your important and delicate duties, and I offer you the constant co-operation of my delegation in order that you may attain this objective. We are sure that your recognized professional skills augur well for the progress towards our goals.

I should also like to thank Ambassador El Ghali Benhima of Morocco for having so ably conducted the delicate final part of the work of our Conference in the month of September and the inter-sessional period. Allow me also to thank Under-Secretary-General Yasushi Akashi and our Secretary-General Ambassador Komatina and Ambassador Berasategui and all the members of the secretariat for the constant support we receive.

As the Conference on Disarmament begins its session I would like to join in the tribute paid to Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, the architect of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and an example of a diplomat with a mission. He is leaving us after more than 25 years of dedication to the cause of disarmament. I would like the delegation of Mexico to convey to Ambassador Garcia Robles the fact that we are not going to forget him and that his efforts will be continued, because he is leaving behind him friends and admirers and a path outlined to continue building peace.

I would like to wish a very warm welcome and offer my co-operation to the new colleagues that are joining our disarmament family this year: Ambassadors Garcia Moritán of Argentina, Shannon of Canada, Hou Zhitong of China, Pérez Novoa of Cuba, Ledogar of the United States, Negrotto Cambiaso of Italy, Donowaki of Japan, Ogada of Kenya, Marín Bosch of Mexico, Rasaputram of Sri Lanka and Arteaga of Venezuela, and last but not least, to extend to you, Sir, the warmest welcome and my offer of support. I cannot conclude my opening remarks without expressing gratitude for the significant messages

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

addressed to us by Presidents Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico and Carlos Saúl Menem of Venezuela, and also the presence in this room of the Foreign Ministers of the Netherlands, Mr. Hans van den Broeke, and Austria, Alois Mock. All this enhances the commencement of our work at this Conference.

According to an old proverb, which I suspect is Chinese, like all ancient proverbs, there is no worse curse or greater blessing for a man than to live in interesting times. I do indeed believe that in our case we are beginning to experience a kind of blessing with the end of the cold war, the start of a large-scale movement for the removal of ideology from international relations and the presence of a kind of stampede throughout the world for civil and political freedoms and democracy, the beginnings of a victory over apartheid and the beginning of a new strategic concept of common international security. 1989 is a year that will be remembered. When later on it is studied by scholars, they may refer to the phenomenon of the revolution of '89. Dialogue, co-operation and possible agreements on additional disarmament measures in the field of strategic weapons and the limitation of nuclear testing and the recent agreement for cuts in troops in Europe and chemical weapon stocks between the United States and the Soviet Union and the negotiations on conventional weapons between NATO and the Warsaw Pact mark the end of the cold war.

These are interesting times that are traced in the news on our television screens and in the press, that make us optimistic and - why not say it? - leave us bewildered. So much so that sometimes we are left behind by events. Not even specialists in international relations, or professional politicians, or very often we diplomats, have immediate answers to this historical acceleration without precedent at the end of this century. Perhaps this is the product of almost 45 years without a wholesale war and the unprecedented growth of science and technology.

As the Conference on Disarmament begins in this context of historical acceleration that I have described, I think it is appropriate to pause and reflect before we embark on the usual rituals of our work. The questions we should reflect on are the following: Is the Conference on Disarmament ready to deal with this process of historical acceleration? Will the Conference be capable of playing a part in the change? Or will we, on the contrary, steeped in an attitude of bewilderment and tied to old rituals and reflexes, stand apart from these events? If we become involved, these interesting times that we are describing will, in accordance with the proverb I quoted, be a blessing. But if we do not, then these times can turn into a curse for the Conference, by leaving us aside.

On the basis of these premises, I hope subsequently to set out some concrete thoughts which are not intended as proposals but as somewhat provocative ideas that I think we should voice in view of the dynamic of the present international situation.

The first point concerns the agenda of our Conference on Disarmament. This agenda is a legacy of the cold war. Some of the items are too abstract - sometimes metaphysical. They were included possibly with a link to the East-West confrontation when there was no possibility of breaking the

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

deadlock in the negotiations and making headway on specific and concrete situations. Perhaps, along this line of thinking, one of our first thoughts should concern whether it is necessary to bring the items on our agenda in a more concrete and specific way into line with the movement in international negotiations and events that are occurring outside this room. Perhaps it might be necessary to exchange views in a very informal way on whether it would be interesting, for example, to hold informal meetings in the Conference, without records, for the purpose of a kind of brainstorming exercise on the revision of the agenda. For instance, through this informal dialogue, which would be direct and frank, would it not be interesting to see whether there is real scope for revitalizing some items or bringing in specific and important new items?

For instance, concerning this present item on "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament", which continues to be the object of a degree of ritual repetition, could it not be revitalized and given a more operational approach, making it possible to set up under this item a kind of procedural link and communication in which, by means of informal plenary meetings without records, the United States and Soviet negotiators on strategic weapons could give us periodic information on progress in their negotiations? And then, perhaps, in formal meetings, under this item, we could be given direct and relevant information from Ministers Baker or Shevardnadze, which I believe, would greatly enhance our work.

Another item on our agenda that could be revitalized in order to bring our Conference into the mainstream of international trends is, I believe, to reach agreement amongst ourselves once and for all on a mandate to establish the ad hoc committee on the cessation of nuclear tests. Whether or not an ad hoc committee is set up on this major issue could be a significant indication that the Conference is not keeping abreast of international political trends that are occurring around it.

In this connection we will support all the efforts that Ambassador Donowaki of Japan is making in order to arrive at a mandate and establish this ad hoc committee at last. At present the United States/Soviet bilateral negotiations are proceeding on limiting the number and yield of tests. It is possible that protocols on this subject may be signed at the forthcoming June summit to be held in Washington between Presidents Bush and Gorbachev. Moreover, the fourth NPT review conference, which is very closely connected with progress made in limiting and halting nuclear tests, is to begin next August. As we can see, there are a series of bilateral and multilateral negotiations that link up with our Conference through the limitation and cessation of nuclear testing. How, then, can we fail to set up the ad hoc committee? Not to do so would offer the clearest proof that the work of the Conference was out of touch with the realities of international life. This is an issue which has as much priority as that of chemical weapons. To reactivate it is to give the work of the Conference political symmetry; I say political symmetry because the Conference is now focusing the bulk of its work on chemical disarmament, to such an extent that it has been said here that the Conference is in fact becoming a preparatory committee for the chemical weapons convention. This does not in any way mean that we should ease up on the work of the Ad hoc Committee on chemical weapons. Quite the

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

contrary: this thought is designed to bring some symmetry to the approach and strategy of our work. At the same time as we are revitalizing other priority issues, we should make an effort so that within a year at most we can come up with the text of a convention on the total prohibition of chemical weapons.

But, thinking aloud again, if we do not manage to do this, if we do not manage to produce this convention text after excessively focusing our work on chemical weapons, the Conference will be faced with a doubly difficult situation, having succeeded neither in finalizing a convention on chemical weapons nor in revitalizing and making headway in other important aspects of disarmament. How could we face the international community and justify these two consecutive years of concentration on chemical weapons without any results? Let us move ahead on chemical weapons, but let us also tackle other fronts. And here I wish to thank and congratulate Ambassador Morel of France for the way in which he chaired the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Ambassador Morel has summed up the present status of the negotiations on chemical weapons with a strategic metaphor and a felicitous expression. In his strategic metaphor he says that "the front has moved" and that if the momentum is maintained we can finalize the convention within a year. His felicitous expression tells us that we are "firmly committed". I think that he is right in both aspects, and that the situation being handed on to us by Ambassador Morel, if we can make full use of it, is promising. I certainly believe that my dear colleague Ambassador Hyltenius, to whom we offer our full co-operation, will have a major responsibility to make sure that the front not only moves, but is broken, and that our full commitment leads to our goal.

In order to do this, it seems to me that we must pursue intensive work on the structural and basic aspects of the convention and not get entangled in a great deal of detail, precision and technicalities. Some sort of choice must be made with the elements we have before us, in order to construct the convention as rapidly as possible. Let us not strive to build it in baroque style. Let us make some sort of choice in order to separate what is important from what is secondary and produce an acceptable convention within a year.

Another subject on which I would like to express some thoughts aloud is that of how we should continue continue to deal with the subject of radiological weapons. It is my experience, as a former Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, that the main problem is epistemological, that is to say, a problem of knowledge. These weapons are a kind of entelechy, which is a metaphysical category used by Greek thinkers to define what has no definite essence or substance. We do not know whether they exist and, if they do, what they are like. Year after year we discuss these entelechies. I am led by my perhaps somewhat provocative thoughts to ask whether it would not be better to concentrate on making progress with something practical and concrete which would help to confront this Conference with the real security needs of this present moment in history, for example by making progress with concrete negotiations to bring about a convention to ban attacks on nuclear facilities, or, as was suggested by Minister van den Broeke of the Netherlands, by beginning examination of the proliferation of ballistic missiles and their technology that can be equipped with weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. de Rivero, Peru)

I have ventured to set forth these thoughts because I think that during interesting times such as those we are living in now it is always necessary to have doubts, since doubt is the basis of all rational, creative, antidogmatic and antiroutine processes. I am not proposing anything. I merely wish to sow this uneasiness among us. Let us consider together how to initiate a creative movement to become involved in the "interesting times" in which we find ourselves and which, in this case, according to the proverb, can so far be a blessing for the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Peru for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador von Stülpnagel.

Mr. von STULPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): The resumption of our efforts in the Conference on Disarmament takes place at a juncture of unprecedented change. I agree with Ambassador de Rivero that we in the CD are facing both a challenge and an opportunity to capitalize on present conditions in order to make substantial progress and to contribute to increased mutual security.

The dynamic political changes in Europe during the last few months have fundamentally improved the prospects for the establishment of a new pattern of relations between the countries of the old continent together with those of the new world. Ideological and military antagonism may effectively be replaced with co-operation, trust and peaceful competition, and human rights and political freedom may be fully guaranteed and enjoyed by all individuals, bringing us closer to the vision of a just, humane and democratic world.

In Europe we are undoubtedly facing an immediate future that is promising but remains uncertain as long as the achievements are not translated and consolidated on a truly universal basis and in a context of stability.

Today the question of stability is no longer linked to the two major blocs. We are entering a phase where much more political subtlety and finesse is needed complementary to super-Power summitry. Continuous efforts must be made in arms control diplomacy and in the European context of the important CSCE process. To assist in giving this process a global scale, the Conference on Disarmament will have to consistently pursue every opportunity for effective contributions beyond its item-related efforts.

Therefore my intention today is different from that of other colleagues. It is not to follow the traditional course of examining the individual items of our agenda, or to assess their prospects for this year's session. I will instead concentrate on one item which conceptually combines the individual fields of our agenda in an effort to chart a more interrelated course for arms control and disarmament and to set a legitimate agenda for its future. I speak of the question of security concepts, military strategies and military doctrines.

It is a universal truth that a possible transformation of national and alliance concepts is considered a prerequisite for the establishment of a distinct road map towards more secure, stable and less antagonistic security

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

structures, at considerably lower and legitimate levels of armaments and armed forces. It has taken decades before we can now officially deal with the question of military doctrines. This delay is in contradiction to the important role played by a combined effort to compare and evaluate conceptual differences in harmonizing arms control and disarmament objectives and defence planning requirements. Doctrines express political objectives, and as such they ultimately determine the extent to which forces may be reduced and the level of confidence-building measures which is desirable or acceptable.

Military strategies and doctrines are founded on assumptions derived from historical experience, national styles and predilections and geostrategic conditions. These are, in general, the driving forces behind the outlook of military establishments. These military establishments, either on a national or an alliance basis, receive their final shape and character often, and unfortunately, in a reaction of overinsurance against neighbouring forces and military options.

Due to this fact military concepts and doctrines have often become the catalysts for dynamism in arms and armed forces procurement, and finally for the arms race itself. This has been demonstrated often enough during the last 40 years in the action/reaction scheme of the varying East/West confrontation. Thus it is all the more encouraging to observe today that in the region with the highest concentration of weapons, and where confrontation between conflicting military doctrines has been inherent, serious attempts are being made to break this vicious circle.

It is of particular importance that this attempt is being made now, at this crucial time of transition, taking due account of the changing political and military situation in Europe as well as in other regions, inter alia by developing thinking on the future design of war prevention strategies and their adjustment to changing perceptions, convictions and background conditions. Thus the new approaches assist the transition considerably by adequately harmonizing arms control and defence planning on the one hand and helping arms control to fully exploit its potential as an agent of change on the other.

Four years ago in his plenary statement before the CDE in Stockholm, Federal Foreign Minister Genscher called for talks on military doctrines. His proposal derived from his conviction that talks on military concepts and strategies between representatives of the Warsaw Pact and NATO, as well as the neutral and non-aligned countries participating in the CSCE, could considerably help to overcome prejudices and could offer a chance and a challenge to crystallize new security policy thinking among all participants, thus contributing to removing unfounded perceptions of threats and enemy images and eliminating distrust and suspicion.

Some two and a half years after the declaration by the Warsaw Pact States on their common military doctrine, and about 10 months after the States of the Western Alliance tabled their proposal for the holding of a seminar on security concepts and military doctrines, these ideas have now been put into effect for the first time in post-war history. From 16 January to 5 February the participants in the negotiations on confidence- and security-building

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

measures in Vienna - 17 of which are members of our Conference - held a seminar which saw for the first time the presence of the most prominent military representatives of the CSCE States.

This seminar was preceded by a trial seminar on military doctrines between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland held in June 1989 near Munich. The substantive and procedural findings of this trial run made valid contributions to the initiation of presentation and discourse at the Vienna seminar.

Despite remaining differences the Vienna seminar witnessed an amazingly high degree of convergence and agreement. All delegations made efforts to ensure openness and dialogue. Their statements were imbued with seriousness of purpose and the realization of their special responsibility for a secure and stable Europe.

Noteworthy was the gratifying willingness of all to face critical questions, give frank answers and be ready to enter into a dialogue with the other side on threat perceptions. The concrete military intentions and planning of the participating States were described in detail, their rationale was scrutinized and questioned, and a comparison was made with the relevant facts. The participants experienced a factual dialogue on all questions of military policy, a dialogue with great openness.

Thus the seminar made an important contribution to disclosing the aims and intentions of military policies, correcting erroneous perceptions and making transparent which armed forces and dispositions are adequate for sufficient defence.

At the suggestion of the neutral and non-aligned delegations a discussion was initiated on criteria for defining defensiveness. Although the discussion was inconclusive, it nevertheless revealed a field to which increased attention should be devoted in the future in order to influence conceptual thinking for future disarmament negotiations. In this context important points of convergence and agreement which should become valid in all parts of the globe have emerged from the different contributions. They include: the principle that the prevention of war is the paramount consideration in all military strategies and security policies; the realization that only defensive security concepts and military doctrines are permissible today; the need for consistency between defensive concepts and doctrines, on the one hand, and the potentials kept in a state of preparedness, and operational principles adopted in practice, on the other; the need to ensure that the interrelationship between arms control issues and defence requirements, as well as the interrelationship between the various arms control areas, are fully taken into account; and finally the acknowledgement that concerns felt by other States on the basis of previous, old armed forces structures and operational principles had often been perfectly justified.

The open dialogue in which a number of States for the first time described and explained their national military doctrines in public, and thus demonstrated their willingness to submit them to analysis, confirmed that unilateral adjustments must precede co-operative endeavours to formalize

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

changes in military force postures. Their irreversibility cannot be achieved as long as important differences between declaratory defence policies and actual operational capabilities persist.

Nevertheless, armed forces will remain an expression of power and represent a possible threat in the eyes of the opposite side, especially when a discrepancy becomes obvious between declarations of defensive military policy and armed forces that are in excess of legitimate security needs.

The defensive character of national or alliance forces does not result from a mere political declaration. A political declaratory affirmation of non-aggression and pledges of non-use alone offer no adequate assurance of security and stability. Defensive character must be underscored by the defence orientation of the concepts of military strategy. It must affect the operational, strategic and military - even technical - levels of the armed forces.

Unless defensive intentions are materially implemented, they will not have the necessary confidence-building and stabilizing effects which are required for the initiation of further substantive cuts in armaments and armed forces themselves. The defensive character of a strategy and military doctrine remains determined mainly by the size, deployment, structure, logistics and training of the armed forces. Thus, there must be no discrepancy between defence policy rhetoric on the one side and actual force structures and employment concepts on the other.

In this regard the discussion of security concepts and military doctrines has found an indisputable place in the process of confidence-building. This dialogue should be used to promote the system of co-operative security structures in Europe. An essential element of co-operative security is to ensure that armed forces have strictly defensive roles. This fundamental prerequisite for shaping a just, lasting and stable peaceful order is not restricted to Europe. In a world where global imbalances threaten to invalidate regional stability, and where regional imbalances tend to undermine global stability, this obligation fully applies to the field of global multilateral responsibility.

Much remains to be done to shape a common view on all relevant criteria for defensive orientation of armed forces and co-operative security structures, ensuring that wars and intimidation of any kind in all regions of the world are prevented and that military aggression becomes an option which no Government could rationally contemplate or hope successfully to undertake, and by so doing to lay the foundations for a world where military forces exist solely to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of their countries.

This is a multilateral obligation and task to which the CD can and must contribute. The task ahead has become more complex, but prospects for its solution have considerably improved. At the start of this year's session the Conference on Disarmament faces an unmatched opportunity to translate the climate of détente based on the current changes towards democracy and pluralism into specific agreements on the priority issues before it, thus promoting and safeguarding the transitions under way.

(Mr. von Stülpnagel, Federal Republic of Germany)

These transitions from confrontation to agreed solutions that we are witnessing in Europe and in many other regions of the world make it incumbent on the CD to relegate its own contradictions so that consensual approaches can take centre stage. The resumption of comparative talks on security policies, military strategies and doctrines offers us considerable support. The Conference should make due use of their results and not miss the chance to adequately complement progress and success in the bilateral and regional negotiations, in particular by contributing to solutions and progress in the main items it is entrusted with.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany for his statement. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not. As agreed earlier today, I shall now suspend this plenary meeting and convene, in a few minutes' time, an informal meeting of the Conference to review the ongoing consultations on a mandate for an ad hoc committee on chemical weapons.

The meeting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 12.15 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 535th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

We shall now proceed, as announced earlier, to take a decision on working paper CD/WP.380, entitled "Draft decision on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons". This text is now being circulated. The text I am proposing today is the result of lengthy consultations, and I hope that it will meet with your approval. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the draft decision is adopted.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now turn to the appointment of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. You will recall that, in its report to the Conference on the 1989 session, the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons recommended that Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden should be appointed as its Chairman for the 1990 session. As the Committee has just been re-established, I intend now to formalize the recommendation whereby Ambassador Hyltenius will be appointed Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I wish to extend my congratulations, as well as those of the Conference, to Ambassador Hyltenius on his appointment. I am convinced that his diplomatic ability, knowledge of the subject and negotiating skills will provide outstanding leadership for the Ad hoc Committee at a decisive stage in its work. I wish Ambassador Hyltenius every success in the heavy responsibilities facing him.

I recognize the distinguished representative of Mexico.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The Group of 21 is very gratified at the decision we have just taken to appoint Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden to chair the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Those of us who work alongside him in the Group of 21 know his skills and human qualities, and we are sure that at this important stage in the work of the Committee he will be able to bring the work entrusted to it to a succesful conclusion.

On behalf of the Group of 21 I should like to make the following statement following the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons.

(continued in English)

On 6 February 1990 the Group of 21 made a statement with regard to the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. It set forth its position on elements that should be included in the mandate, that is, the time factor, the deletion of the restriction on final drafting and a reference to the prohibition of use.

The Group of 21 welcomes the inclusion of the first two elements in the mandate just adopted by the Conference. However, it is to the deep regret of the Group of 21 that the Conference has not been able to include a reference to the prohibition of use.

The Group of 21 has joined the consensus on the mandate in order to ensure the prompt resumption of the important work of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. We continue to believe that the present mandate does not specify in clear terms that the prohibition of use is covered. This element is of paramount importance to the Group, as well as to the vast majority of other members of the Conference.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Mr. President, my delegation will have the opportunity to welcome the new colleagues who have recently joined us in our work in the Conference on Disarmament. I would, therefore, like to limit myself to expressing my personal satisfaction to see you in the Chair. I keep in my memory very pleasant impressions of our close contacts and co-operation from the years you and I were for the first time assigned to this body. May I also wholeheartedly congratulate Ambassador Hyltenius on his appointment as the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for this 1990 session, and offer him our full co-operation in his endeavours in fulfilling his very important job?

In my capacity as Item Co-ordinator, I should like on behalf of our Group to place on record the following statement on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. Our Group welcomes the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and expresses its hope and belief that under the new Chairman, the intensive pace of negotiations towards the early conclusion of the chemical weapons convention will be continued. Once again, I would like to congratulate Ambassador Morel for the competent and creative manner in which he steered the work of the Committee last session. We have just adopted a new mandate for the Ad hoc Committee; we are

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

particularly pleased to see in its new version the deletion of the phrase "except for its final drafting". In our Group's opinion, this is a significant improvement enabling us to enter the decisive stage of our negotiations on the comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons to meet the expectations of the world community for the final elaboration of the convention at the earliest date, as so clearly expressed in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference, as well as during the Government-Industry Conference held in Canberra and in two unanimous resolutions of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

Our Group supported deeper changes in the mandate along the lines proposed by the Group of 21. We attach special importance to the inclusion of a reference to the prohibition of use of chemical weapons, to be consistent with the scope of the future convention and with the language used in General Assembly resolutions 44/115 A and B and in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. Nevertheless, the most important task ahead of us is to start effective work on the convention without delay. This is why we have joined the consensus in accepting the mandate in its present form, which is, in any case, a very good and important improvement. We would like to express our thanks to you, Mr. President, for your able efforts to bring us to this compromise. However, we do hope that the course of negotiations on the chemical weapons convention will bring us during this session to the moment when we will be able once again to address the question of further changes in the mandate.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Poland for his statement, and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now recognize the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I would like to join the other speakers in congratulating Ambassador Hyltenius on his being appointed to the post as Chairman of the CW Ad hoc Group. He and his very able delegation will have a big task ahead of them this year as our work on CW accelerates.

I would like to say a few words first about the reservation on the final drafting. In support of President Bush's initiatives on chemical weapons and his personal commitment to the early achievement of the chemical weapons convention, the United States has joined the consensus to accept the amendment to the Ad hoc Committee's mandate, dropping the phrase "except for final drafting". I must point out, however, that this amendment to drop the caveat will in no way change the United States' requirement for full debate of the remaining substantive issues. Thus, we wish to clarify that elimination of the caveat against final drafting does not mean that we have now entered the final stage of the CW negotiations. The United States believes that there is considerable work remaining before reaching this stage of final drafting. It is our understanding that final drafting would only start after the substantive issues in the negotiations have been resolved. Having said this, I would like to underscore the United States' readiness and the readiness of my delegation to help resolve those remaining issues.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

On the issue of incorporating into the mandate the word "use", let me say the following. As we all know, the 1925 Geneva Protocol bans the use of chemical weapons, but many States, including many here around this table, entered into a reservation giving the reserving State the right to use chemical weapons in response to a chemical weapons attack against the reserving State or its allies. It is essential that the United States retain the right to retaliate in kind to chemical weapon attack on the United States or its forces as long as we possess chemical weapons. We thus need to preserve this security option during the transition to a régime banning all chemical weapons. Furthermore, it is the view of the United States that it is inappropriate to single out or emphasize only certain areas in the chemical weapons mandate. In our draft text the parties would also undertake not to acquire chemical weapons, not to retain chemical weapons, not to transfer them, not to assist, encourage or induce anyone else to engage in any of the prohibited activities, and we are not adding all of those other prohibitions to the mandate.

I have been asked why it is that two days ago I circulated here in this body the text of a communiqué entered into by the United States and the USSR, where the world "use" was specified. I think the lesson there is very clear. When we are talking about use as an objective of the convention, we certainly stand by the words that are in our own text and the modifications to it that have come forward, but when the word "use" is a stalking-horse for some other purpose, we will continue to resist its being singled out for special attention in that regard.

Mr. HOU (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. President, today we are very happy to see that under your able guidance and through serious and constructive consultations we have ironed out some of the differences on the issue of the mandate for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, so that the Ad hoc Committee can be re-established and start its work as soon as possible. This is the hope that our delegation has always held. For this I would like to congratulate you and the plenary. Within this short period of 10 days our Conference on Disarmament has achieved one success after another and created excellent conditions for smooth running of the future substantive negotiations. We would like to thank you for your fruitful leadership. At the same time we would like to thank the Group of 21 as well as all the other groups for their co-operative spirit and the active contributions they have made.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Ambassador of France, Mr. Morel, once again for his contribution during the 1989 session. I would like to express our appreciation for the excellent work accomplished by him and the chairmen of the five working groups. I warmly congratulate the distinguished Ambassador of Sweden, Mr. Hyltenius, who has been appointed as the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. We believe that with his rich experience and diplomatic skill he will help the Ad hoc Committee to achieve new results. Our delegation will co-operate with you fully, Sir, as well as with the Ad hoc Committee.

(Mr. Hou, China)

We are very happy to see that some important improvements have been made in the new mandate. The phrase "except for its final drafting" has been deleted and the constructive formulation "at the earliest date", taken from the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference, has been incorporated. We have a positive evaluation of this achievement. At the same time we share the regret of the Group of 21 that we have not been able to achieve consensus on the inclusion of the important term "prohibition of use" in the mandate. I would like to say that the Chinese delegation has not changed its principled position that the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons should be included in the future comprehensive convention. Consensus on the inclusion of the prohibition of use in the convention was achieved in the early 1980s, and is already reflected in the "rolling text". We hope that this agreement will be embodied in the work of the new Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. We would like once again to express our hope that the constructive consultations and co-operative spirit among member States will enable the negotiations in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and in the Conference as a whole to achieve new progress.

Mr. REESE (Australia): The Western Group welcomes the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons under a mandate which, we believe, will enable the negotiations to proceed at full pace. We note that some differences remain among delegations in regard to the mandate. These can always be further addressed in the life of the Ad hoc Committee.

We would like to congratulate Ambassador Hyltenius on his appointment as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. We know his qualities well, and see him as a most fitting successor to Ambassador Morel. I assure him that the Western Group looks forward to the closest co-operation with him in expediting the negotiations in this critical year as we move closer to the completion of a chemical weapons convention.

The PRESIDENT: We have heard the statements just made on the mandate of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I am sure that the points raised therein will be the subject of consultations amongst the delegations. I now recognize the representative of Sweden.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks to you, Mr. President, for your kind words, and to all my colleagues for their good wishes in connection with my appointment as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I am grateful for the trust placed in my country and my delegation and in me personally. I am very much aware of the great responsibility which this task entails, and I can assure you that I will spare no effort to live up to this responsibility.

The convention is clearly within reach, thanks to the contributions made by all delegations and by the chairmen of the Ad hoc Committee. I should like to pay tribute in particular to my predecessor, Ambassador Morel, who led the work of the Committee in a very active and skilful manner. He embodied both the letter and the spirit of the Paris Declaration and made us literally redouble our efforts. Considerable progress was made on a number of issues, and this is in large measure due to the untiring efforts by Ambassador Morel and his working group chairmen.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

I note with satisfaction the improvement of the mandate for our negotiations, as well as the increasing number of participating non-member States.

In parallel to the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, other significant events have taken place. The United Nations has once again urged us to intensify our negotiations on a chemical weapons convention with a view to its final elaboration at the earliest date. Important conferences on chemical weapons have been held in Paris and in Canberra, and a constructive bilateral negotiating process is under way between the two leading military Powers, also in the field of chemical disarmament.

The impetus thus continues to build up. We have yet not had a decisive political breakthrough, but I hope it will come in the near future. Almost all the elements of the text are on the table. It is now primarily, but not exclusively, a matter of taking the necessary political decision in order to move to the final stages of our work. It is therefore with confidence in the opportunity which we now have that I take up my duties as Chairman.

Before concluding this brief statement, I wish to express my sincere thanks for the many pledges of co-operation and support that have been made to me both today and while I have been conducting consultations with my colleagues in preparation for this task. The Committee will start as soon as possible after the adoption of the report on the inter-sessional work. According to present plans it is envisaged that the first meeting of the Ad hoc Committee will be held on Wednesday, 21 February at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Sweden for his statement. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not.

I should like to recall that, as I indicated at our plenary meeting on Tuesday last, I intend to put before the Conference for adoption at our next plenary meeting on Tuesday, 20 February, the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons contained in document CD/961. I wish also to report to you that I am actively continuing my consultations on the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee under agenda item 5, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", and I hope that I shall soon be in a position to announce that, thanks to the co-operation of all members, an agreement has been reached on that subject.

I have no other business for today. I now intend to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 20 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

20 February 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 20 February 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hendrik Wagenmakers (Netherlands)

CE.90-60211/1574B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 536th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

At the outset, I should like to extend a warm welcome, on behalf of the Conference and myself, to His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs of Finland, Ambassador Aarno Karhilo, who is visiting the Conference and will address us as first speaker. The Under-Secretary of State is well known to us, as he addressed the Conference twice last year, in keeping with the active participation with which Finland, a non-member, contributes to the work of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies. I wish to thank the Under-Secretary of State for his continued interest in our work and wish him a successful mission in Geneva.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference begins today its consideration of agenda items 1, "Nuclear test ban", and 2, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". However, in conformity with rule 30 of its rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

As announced previously, once the list of speakers is exhausted, I shall put before the Conference for adoption the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, contained in document CD/961.

I have on my list of speakers today His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs of Finland and the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I now give the floor to His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs of Finland, Ambassador Aarno Karhilo.

Mr. KARHILO (Finland): The Conference on Disarmament is a forum for global disarmament, but very often regional developments are of global significance. Let me therefore start by briefly discussing the situation in Europe.

Since I last addressed this forum, barely seven months ago, Europe has undergone deep changes and the process is not over yet. The pace of events has been breath-taking in Central and Eastern Europe. This spring will be a period of historic decisions in many of those countries, a period of promises and expectations. A new kind of security structure in Europe is emerging and its contours are being shaped.

If we want to avoid being led to an unpredictable future by the revolutionary change, it is essential to have road signs and milestones to assure us that the road we are embarking on is secure.

The relationship of political dialogue and co-operation, especially in the field of arms control and disarmament, between the Soviet Union and the United States has been and will be a key element of stability amidst all the turbulence.

(Mr Karhilo, Finland)

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has also proved to be an element of stability as well as of peaceful change. It will have a growing role in the joint management of the ongoing changes in Europe. The forthcoming summit of the 35 CSCE participating States will be an important stock-taking event. We expect that the first results of the CFE negotiations will be ready for signature by that time. The summit can also give new impetus to further negotiations on disarmament in Europe within the framework of the CSCE.

Prospects for substantial disarmament measures this year are promising. With the anticipated first results of the CFE talks, Europe is shaking off part of its reputation of being the most heavily armed continent in the world. We welcome the new results in the bilateral disarmament negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States as announced in their joint statement in Moscow 10 days ago. The goal set by them to conclude a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms by the end of this year earns the sincere support of the world community, as it holds out the hope of further diminishing the nuclear threat.

In this forum Finland especially welcomes the new US-Soviet agreement on the gradual elimination of their chemical weapons. Although conditional, the commitments announced in Moscow on 10 February mark in a concrete way the recognition of the special responsibility which the great Powers - the possessors of the largest CW stocks - have ahead of complete CW elimination.

This mutual preparedeness of the great Powers to start the destruction of the bulk of their CW stocks to equal low levels pending the conclusion of the CW convention is, in Finland's view, an important catalyst for resolving the remaining political problems in the multilateral CW negotiatons. The focus of the negotiations in the CD must by their nature be global, but the bilateral progress in the CW issues is a valuable and necessary contribution to our talks in Geneva. We hope that the finalizing stage will soon be at hand and that the political commitments to the expeditious conclusion of the convention - made by the Paris and Canberra Conferences - will be redeemed this year.

During the last decade disarmament has become unthinkable without strict verification. Indeed, some earlier agreements, like the biological weapons convention, are today considered inadequate in this respect. The detailed provisions required for an adequate verification régime necessarily involve time-consuming drafting and testing of methods and instruments.

The verification of the CW convention will be more complex than in any disarmament agreement yet. Despite all the work that has been done on this subject, doubts are still occasionally voiced as to the verifiability of the convention. The relative ease and inexpensiveness of the manufacture of CW agents has been cited as a factor which renders the verification of compliance impossible.

(Mr. Kathilo, Finland)

If we were to design a régime that covers all possible covert activities, the problems might well prove to be insurmountable. But we are not trying to do that. In our view, a disarmament agreement banning chemical weapons is effective when we can be sure that existing stocks are destroyed and that militarily significant chemicals are not produced or diverted for military purposes.

The necessary confidence that the purpose of the convention is fulfilled can, in our view, be achieved by the means already envisaged in the negotiations. The combination of routine inspections, challenge inspections and ad hoc verification measures allows a variety of ways to ensure compliance with the provisions of the convention.

The work of the Technical Group on Instrumentation has clearly proved that all the verification tasks involving chemical analysis can be adequately performed with currently available instruments and methods. This conclusion has been further reinforced by the inter-laboratory "round robin" experiment which was carried out by 10 laboratories last autumn. The results of this experiment will be introduced to the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons shortly. The Technical Group on Instrumentation identified in its report several items for further work in other than purely analytical fields. When properly addressed and focused upon, none of these items should prove to be unsolvable.

The development of technical means for verification has been the focus of Finland's contribution to the CW negotiations. Since 1973 the Finnish Research Project on the Verification of Chemical Disarmament has developed sensitive and selective analytical methods to meet the verification requirements of a chemical weapons convention. The project has from its start kept full academic openness as its hallmark. No aspect of the project is classified or otherwise restricted. The scientific results have been introduced to the CD annually in the form of the "Finnish blue books", which now total 14 volumes.

The appreciative comments that we have heard from many delegations in the CD over the years have been an encouragement to the scientists involved in the project, as well as to my Government, to enlarge the scope of our endeavours through new types of initiatives. One of those has been the holding and co-ordination of the inter-laboratory "round robin" experiment I have already referred to. Another has been a training programme in CW verification methods for analytical chemists from developing countries belonging to the Group of 21. The first course of the programme is now under way.

The interest shown in this training programme exceeded our expectations. A total of 25 highly qualified chemists from nine countries applied for the first two courses to be organized this year. During this initial year one chemist each from Brazil, India, Iran, Kenya, Nigeria and Pakistan will receive training in the two four-month courses for the use of analytical methods and relevant instruments in CW verification. The Finnish Research Project intends to continue with a similar training programme during 1991, for which an invitation will be circulated to the members of the Group of 21 in the near future. The applications presented for this year's courses will the-

(Mr. Karhilo, Finland)

The sole purpose of the Finnish Research Project has been to contribute to the CW negotiations. After the conclusion of the CW convention, the purpose of the project and its laboratory will be to contribute to the implementation of the convention. The organizational forms of the analytical work needed under the convention have not been discussed in detail so far. However, at this stage we can already pledge that whatever the organizational structures will be, the resources of the Finnish project, both scientific know-how and material facilities, will be dedicated to the service of the convention and the organization.

In this spirit, the Government of Finland has decided to offer these resources to be used as the core of the central laboratory of the CWC organization. The laboratory of the Finnish Research Project will meet the high requirements to be attached to such an international scientific institution. We believe that the best way to ensure the required high standard of quality, reliability and confidence for the analytical work is to base the organization's activities in this particular field on an established and well-known institution rather than on yet-to-be-created laboratories. The benefits of this approach are obvious.

A total ban on chemical weapons can be truly total only if it is universally adhered to. The universality of the convention will be its main pillar when it is in force, but is also the main factor behind the relatively slow progress in the negotiations. To take care of the interests of all nations in an equitable way and to assure them that no country will gain an undue edge, either military or technological, over the others is a demanding task. In order to achieve this, it is of the utmost importance that no country will be deprived of the possibility of participating in the negotiations if it wishes to do so. This basic requirement should be supported by other measures which serve the same goal of universality.

During the 1989 session we very much appreciated the extra care the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons took to encourage the observer delegations to participate actively, as well as to report on progress achieved to those delegations that are not represented at all in the negotiations. The regional efforts undertaken by Australia and Indonesia to promote awareness of CW issues is also a good example of possible measures. The Finnish CW verification training programme, too, is meant to serve the purpose of universality.

We wish the new Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, every success in his demanding task of guiding the negotiations to a long-awaited final breakthrough.

I have spoken at length about CW issues, which relate to only one of the items before this Conference. This is due to the priority we attach to the rapid conclusion of the CW convention. I will now move to the first agenda item, "Nuclear test ban".

(Mr. Karhilo, Finland)

A comprehensive nuclear test ban is needed to curb the qualitative refinement of nuclear weapons. Finland, like many other countries, considers that the international nuclear non-proliferation régime embodied in the NPT would be strengthened by the complete prohibition of all nuclear tests and explosions. However, we have difficulty agreeing with those who, in addition, maintain that a comprehensive test ban is a prerequisite for the preservation of the non-proliferation régime. Such a linkage could do a disservice to both.

One of the key concerns regarding a comprehensive test ban is - not surprisingly, I might add - its verifiability. Here, as in connection with the CW convention, we think it can be done. The appropriate technical means are already available. Our own research conducted by the Finnish Research Project on Seismological Verification of Nuclear Tests has convinced us on that score.

However, we are equally convinced that there is no short-cut to a test ban. Verification provisions need to be carefully worked out and tested. The appropriate forum to do that is this Conference and, within it, the Group of Scientific Experts. Finland participates actively in the work of the GSE, as well as in the important ongoing GSETT-2 data exchange experiment.

In order to be optimal, seismic verification facilities should be evenly distributed round the globe. However, the network of seismographic stations in the southern hemisphere is scattered. In order to contribute to the improvement of this situation, Finland has for a decade co-operated with Zambia in establishing a seismic network, training the operators of the network and, most recently, assisting the Lusaka seismic station to participate in the GSETT-2 experiment.

The valuable work done by the GSE cannot, however, conceal the fact that the Conference has not been able to establish an ad hoc committee on a nuclear test ban. Its establishment now and a good start to its deliberations would facilitate the successful outcome of the NPT review conference later this year.

Finland looks forward to this fourth NPT review conference as an opportunity to strengthen the international non-proliferation régime. Finland and the other Nordic countries have already outlined a number of practical measures in this regard. My country is a firm supporter of the NPT. Indeed, in our opinion, it remains the single most significant disarmament measure undertaken by the international community so far. We are also a firm supporter of a comprehensive test ban. However, in the light of the present realities, it is doubtful whether the suggested amendment of the partial test-ban Treaty to make it a comprehensive one is the practical answer to the test ban issue. Nevertheless, as a party to the test-ban Treaty Finland will, as we have already informed the depositaries, attend the amendment conference and will do so in a constructive spirit.

In our view, the amendment conference should focus on giving political impetus to the cause of banning nuclear tests, in the same way that the Paris Conference did to the cause of banning chemical weapons. We hope that this view can be shared by other States parties to the Treaty.

The PRESIDENT: I thank His Excellency the Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs of Finland for his important statement. I now give the floor to the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Batsanov.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): First of all I should like to welcome the Under-Secretary of State for Political Affairs of Finland, Mr. Karhilo, who is here in Geneva. His statement contained a number of important and interesting points. Finland has long since earned praise as an active participant in the negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, as well as other issues on the agenda of the Conference. It is making a considerable contribution to progress at the negotiations, particularly in the field of verification of chemical disarmament. This is greatly appreciated by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and Finland have agreed to co-operate in the development of procedures and means of verification, as was announced during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Finland in October 1989. We hope that such co-operation will be of practical use to our negotiations here in this forum.

Today the Soviet delegation has taken the floor to present working paper CD/966. This is a report on a trial challenge inspection at a military facility conducted last year in the Soviet Union. Trial inspections at industrial enterprises, which were proposed in a Soviet initiative two years ago, have proved useful in the development and "fine tuning" of a system to verify the non-production of chemical weapons. At the same time they have prompted a number of States to think about the advisability of testing other verification procedures under a future convention, and in particular the important procedure of challenge inspection. The Soviet Union has not only supported this idea, but has taken steps to put it into effect.

When selecting a facility for the holding of a trial challenge inspection we bore in mind that under the future convention such an inspection may be conducted at any site or facility in a State party, without the right of refusal on its part. It is felt that the most typical grounds for challenge may be doubt based on the suspected covert storage or production of chemical weapons. Against this background the facility selected for the trial inspection was an arms depot at which chemical weapons are not and have never been stored. The area of the facility is about 3 square kilometres, and the perimeter about 7 kilometres. Located in the area are approximately 100 buildings and structure with a storage capacity equivalent to more than 1,000 railway wagons.

The trial inspection was conducted over a period of five days. The size of the inspection team, including observers, was 20 persons. They included armaments experts, specialists in CW detection and experts from the Soviet delegation to the Conference on Disarmament, who are very familiar with the background of the negotiations on this issue. The team owed its relatively large size to the fact that besides conducting the inspection it had to deal with all the organizational problems connected with the preparations for and the conduct of the inspection. While preparing for the inspection we tried to establish conditions as close as possible to actual ones. However, as this was a national exercise and the first one of its kind, some exceptions had to

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

the objectives of the inspection team and the timing of its visit, which of course would not be the case for actual inspections. However, no actions were accomplished in direct reaction to the team's visit to the facility. The inspection proper began with a meeting in which the team members and the facility management participated. Instruction was provided in accident protection. Then the inspection team was divided into four subgroups: a subgroup to study documentation, a subgroup to inspect buildings and structures, a subgroup to monitor means of transport and the facility perimeter, and a subgroup to work with the facility staff.

The principal focus of attention during the inspection was proper balance between the task of ensuring effective verification and that of safeguarding confidential information. The inspection team endeavoured to refrain from gathering information unrelated to chemical weapons. Nevertheless, a large amount of such information concerning the depot came to the notice of the inspectors. The inspection team visited 10 per cent of the installations located within the depot. However, that did not adversely affect the effectiveness of the inspection. In the first place all the types of buildings and structures were visited on a selective basis at the discretion of the members of the team. Secondly, although the facility management had designated the most sensitive areas which, it felt, had no connection with chemical weapons, the inspection team did not find the alternative measures proposed by the management sufficiently persuasive and visited those areas.

In selecting specific areas to be visited, the inspectors took into account such factors as the presence of air purification systems in storage areas, the presence of protective gear and decontamination equipment in and immediately next to storage areas, the presence of specially protected sectors, the absence of data on individual storage areas or other subdivisions of the facility within the overall system of documentation, separate record-keeping for individual subdivisions, or cases where items had been removed from storage areas immediately prior to the arrival of the inspection team, which came to light as a result of examination of the documentation and interviews with the facility staff. In this exercise the inspection team began its work with the least intrusive verification methods. The principle of "managed access" also governed the interviews with the facility staff. In the course of the interviews the representatives of the management who were present were able to reject those questions which, in their opinion, went beyond the purposes of the inspection, but if the members of the inspection team considered that a question was important, the situation was resolved between the leader of the inspection team and the facility director.

As a result of the trial inspection, the inspection team confirmed that there were no chemical weapons at the facility. It should be pointed out, however, that the steps and measures taken during the inspection proved to be sufficient to a large extent because the members of the inspection team were familiar with the designations of types of Soviet chemical weapons, and were thus able to dispense with the need to open the munitions in order to determine the types of charge used.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

Verification of the presence or absence of undeclared or unknown forms or types of chemical weapons is indeed a complicated task. To perform this task it may be necessary to open specimens of munitions, devices and containers. It would therefore seem advisable to consider the possibility of developing verification methods and equipment by means of which it can be determined without opening it that a given specimen is not a chemical weapon.

As a result of the inspection, the team drew up a number of conclusions and suggestions, which are also set out in the report presented today. In particular, the team came to the conclusion that in order to reduce the level of disclosure of sensitive information which is not CW-related, the management of a facility being inspected must be able during the inspection to propose alternative measures as a substitute for access by the inspectors to particularly confidential information. However, the test of acceptability of such alternative measures must in every case be that they are satisfactory to the inspection team. The results of the inspection also demonstrate that the international inspectorate must undertake to safeguard confidential information which may become known to the inspectors in the course of the inspection. Hence, for example, where no breaches are identified, the inspection report should contain a minimum of factual information and should not reveal the nature of the activities conducted at the inspected facility.

In presenting document CD/966, the Soviet delegation hopes that it will contribute to the constructive consideration of the challenge inspection problem and facilitate deeper investigation of issues related to such inspections.

In conclusion, I would like to say a few words in connection with the fact that in a few moments we will be adopting the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Ambassador Pierre Morel of France for the successful completion of his work as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee. I believe the progress reflected in the report is due to a large extent to the tireless efforts of Ambassador Morel and his thorough approach to the complicated issues which are on the negotiating table, his energy and his flexibility. I should also like to congratulate Ambassador Carl-Magnus Hyltenius of Sweden on his election to the post of Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for this year, and to express the conviction that under his leadership we will be able to achieve a decisive breakthrough on the convention.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his statement. That concludes my list of speakers today. Does any other member wish to take the floor? It seems not.

We shall now proceed to adopt the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, as contained in document CD/961. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the report of the Ad hoc Committee.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: I should like now to report to you briefly on a number of organizational questions. I wish to announce that the first meeting of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons during the present annual session will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 21 February, at 3 p.m. in Conference room V. I am informed that the Chairmen of the Ad hoc Committees on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear-weapon States against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Radiological Weapons are consulting at present before these subsidiary bodies formally start their work. The opening meetings of the Ad hoc Committees will be announced as soon as these consultations are concluded. In connection with the re-establishment of the Ad hoc Committee under agenda item 5, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", I am continuing my consultations with a view to reaching early agreement on this question. Once work in the subsidiary bodies starts, we shall then proceed as usual to circulate a timetable of meetings of the Conference and its subsidiary bodies, for the information of delegations.

I have no other business for today, and I shall therefore now adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 22 February, at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.